WELFARE *in* REVIEW

NOVEMBER
1963
Vol 1 - No 5

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND
WELFARE
Welfare
Administration

BOSTON
UNIVERSITY
MAR 6 1964
LIBRARIES

U. S.
DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

Welfare Administration

Children's
Bureau

Bureau of Family
Services

Office of Aging

Office of Juvenile
Delinquency and
Youth Development

Cuban Refugee
Program Staff

WELFARE in REVIEW

Welfare In Review is the official monthly publication of the Welfare Administration. Statements in Review articles do not necessarily reflect official policies of the Welfare Administration.

Welfare in Review is prepared in the Division of Research, Office of the Commissioner, Welfare Administration. Suggestions or comments should be addressed to the Editor, Welfare in Review, Welfare Administration, 330 Independence Avenue S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201.

Contents of the publication are not copyrighted; any items may be reprinted but citation of Welfare in Review as the source is requested.

Use of funds for printing this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget July 22, 1963.

Welfare in Review is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: $2.50 per year; $1 additional for foreign mailing. 30 cents per single copy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE, Secretary

Welfare Administration

ELLEN WINSTON, Commissioner

JOSEPH H. MEYERS, Deputy Commissioner

Volume 1 Number 5

NOVEMBER 1963

In This Issue:

	Page
AFDC In Review 1936 - 1962	1
The Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963	16
Publications of Interest	22
Program and Operating Statistics: Public assistance recipients and payments, August 1963 OASDI benefits, August 1963	24
Notes and Announcements	15, 21, 38

AFDC In Review 1936 - 1962

THE aid to families with dependent children program has been in effect for more than 27 years. In that time it has provided public funds to help millions of impoverished families and children. At the end of calendar year 1962, 50 States and the District of Columbia 1/ provided AFDC to more than 885,000 needy families, including almost 2.7 million children and about 906,000 adults. The total number of families aided in December 1962 was almost eight times the number aided in December of 1936, the first year of operation under the Social Security Act when State programs were relatively few and small, and about two and a half times the number in December 1940. The 1962 total of adults and children aided was more than four times the number of recipients 22 years earlier. What explains the manifold increase in AFDC caseloads over a period when the Nation as a whole has risen out of the great depression of the 1930's to new heights of productivity and living standards? Who are the poor families and children in the United States; why are they poor; how many do they number; and what proportion of them are helped by AFDC? What economic factors influence AFDC caseloads to increase or decrease from time to time? Why do people come on assistance? Why do they leave? How do trends vary among individual States? This analysis attempts to provide some estimates, conclusions, and hypotheses to answer these questions.

What Factors Account for the Growth in AFDC Caseloads From 1936 to 1962?

AFDC has grown over the years in response to a variety of different influences. Among these factors the most important are the following:

1. Growth in the number of States operating programs with Federal financial participation
2. Amendments to the Federal Act that have expanded coverage of the programs
3. Growth in the child population
4. Growth in the number of broken families in the total population
5. Improvement in State assistance standards that has led to expansion of the number of low-income families defined as financially needy and eligible for AFDC <u>if</u> they meet other eligibility conditions
6. Social and economic forces in our society that continue to result in a more numerous impoverished population in the United States than is generally recognized

---

By Ellen J. Perkins, Chief, Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Family Services.

1/ Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam also administered Federally aided programs in December 1962 but are not included in this analysis.

From 1936 to 1955, a substantial part of the growth in AFDC caseloads occurred because additional States initiated and developed Federally aided programs. In December 1936, 27 States administered AFDC with Federal aid; by 1940, the number of States had increased to 43. The last State to initiate a program, Nevada, did so in 1955. By 1940 or 1941, however, all but a handful of States--most of them small--had Federal-State programs. From that time, other factors than new State programs more substantially affected growth and change in the National totals.

Since 1940, by far the largest part of the increase in AFDC recipients can be attributed to Federal amendments that expanded program scope or the recipient count and to the rapid growth in the child population. The effect on the total number of adults and children receiving aid in 1962 was:

AFDC recipients in December 1962 totaled		3,595,000
An increase over the 1940 total (865,000) of		
(Number).....	2,730,000	
(Percent).....	315	
Effects of Federal amendments and an increasing child population account for at least.....		2,090,000
This figure includes:		
Adults and children in families with unemployed parents (amendment effective May 1961).	296,000	
Adults not previously counted as recipients (amendments effective October 1950 and October 1962).....	805,000	
The increase in children receiving aid attributable to general increase in the child population since 1940	939,000	
AFDC recipients not accounted for by amendments or increase in the child population totaled		1,505,000
Compared with the total recipient load in 1940, this figure by itself represents an increase of		
(Number).....	640,000	
(Percent).....	74	

Most of the 74 percent increase not accounted for by amendments or child population increase can be said to represent the "real" increase that has come about aolely because State programs have been liberalized to reach a larger proportion of needy children. In most States such increased coverage has occurred primarily as a result of increases in assistance standards rather than through liberalization of other eligibility standards or requirements. In some part, however, the 74 percent increase reflects the increase in the number of broken homes in our total population, counteracted to some degree by a declining need for AFDC among orphaned children.

The effect of increasing numbers of broken homes. From its beginning in 1936, the AFDC program has been directed toward providing financial support and social services for children deprived of parental support to make it possible for them to grow up in their own homes. The program originally was based in long-established Mothers' Aid programs that were administered in a number of individual States and provided assistance to

widows and orphans. Under the Social Security Act, however, the scope of public aid was expanded to include all children living in family homes who are deprived of parental support because one or both of their parents are absent from the home or are physically or mentally incapacitated. Not until May 1961, as pointed out above, was coverage extended further to include children deprived of parental support because their parents are unemployed. In substantial part, therefore, the AFDC program has always been intended to serve the child whose home has been broken by death or by other reasons for absence of one of his parents. For by far the majority of AFDC families and children, the absent parent is the father. Over the more than two and a half decades that the AFDC program has been in operation, ever larger proportions of AFDC families have been families whose fathers are alive but absent from the home and ever smaller proportions have been families of children whose fathers are dead.

Fewer of the AFDC children are orphans now than some years ago for two reasons: fewer children in the total population are orphans, and most children who are orphaned have other resources than AFDC for support. Survivors' benefits under the social insurance program and veterans' programs now provide the primary support for orphaned children. Despite the decrease in the total number of orphans in our population, the number of orphans now receiving some kind of public support substantially exceeds the number so aided in 1948, when families of orphaned children represented almost a fourth of all AFDC families.

The increased proportion among AFDC families of homes broken by a living father's absence, therefore, is in part a result of the decline in need for AFDC among homes broken by a father's death. More importantly, however, the increase is due to the fact that the number of homes broken by divorce, separation, and desertion or because the parents of the children never married is increasing among all groups of our population. The percent of total families in the Nation with own children that were headed by women, for example, increased from 6 percent in 1950 to 7 percent in 1960; in other words, the proportion of such broken families increased by almost 17 percent.

Moreover, single-parent families are more likely to be dependent than two-parent families. When only one parent is left both to support and to care for the children, the risk of inadequate income is much greater than in father-mother families. Much of the American family's present relatively high standard of living comes about because both parents work. A single parent is then obviously disadvantaged by his lone income, assuming--particularly for mothers--that care of the children will permit full-time employment for even the one parent. Usually, such employment will not be compatible with best interests of the children, unless free day care is provided for the children or the mother has skills and education that command a relatively high salary or wage so that she can herself employ competent staff to care for the children. Most women who head families, however, have relatively little education and training and if they decide to work most often must take service jobs, usually domestic service, among the lowest paid of all occupations. And free day care facilities are not

available in a great majority of American communities.

As the number of broken homes in the total population has increased, the proportion of AFDC families broken by a living father's absence has increased for each kind of reason for absence, be it divorce, separation, desertion, or the fact that the parents were never married. The largest group of such families, however, is those in which the parents never married. While now the largest single group of AFDC families, they include only about one in five of all illegitimate children in the United States. The vast majority of illegitimate children are supported in full or in part by their natural families or by adoptive families.

Data on illegitimacy are difficult to obtain accurately and equitably among all income, cultural, and racial groups. No precise estimates can be made, therefore, to enable us to evaluate the effect in increasing AFDC caseloads of the growing rate of illegitimacy in the total population as compared with the effect of increased incidence of AFDC coverage among needy illegitimate children. No estimates at all are available for the period 1940 to 1961. An approximate estimate for the changes from 1958 to 1961, however, is perhaps feasible. The total number of illegitimate children in the United States is estimated to have increased from roughly 2.5 million in 1958 to 3.0 million in 1961 2/, an increase of about 20 percent. Over the same period, illegitimate children aided on AFDC are estimated to have increased by about 40 percent. 3/ Thus, about half the increase (20 percent) over the three years could be attributed to the rise in illegitimacy and about half to increased AFDC coverage among needy illegitimate children. The number representing increased coverage over the three years would include only 50,000 to 75,000 of the total 2.7 million children on AFDC in December 1961.

The effect of improved State assistance standards. The degree to which AFDC coverage among low-income families has been expanded through improved State assistance standards is demonstrable but not measurable with available data. A much oversimplified example will demonstrate the effect. Assume a State monthly cost standard for basic living requirements of $90 for a family. Under this standard, all families with monthly income of

---

2/ An estimate by the National Office of Vital Statistics, from data recorded on birth certificates.

3/ An estimate by the Bureau of Family Services, based on data supplied by State public assistance agencies from knowledge gained about AFDC families in the course of investigations as to eligibility for assistance. States were asked to report illegitimacy status according to provisions of State law, not necessarily on the basis of recorded status on the birth certificate. Both because more is known about AFDC families than about the general population and also because members of lower-income populations are more likely to record illegitimate births and less likely to be able to make arrangements to legitimize the child after conception or birth, data on illegitimacy among AFDC families is more likely to be an overstatement than an understatement of incidence among such families, compared with total population.

$90 or more of their own will not be eligible for assistance. If the State raises the cost standard to $95, however, another group of low-income families--those with income from $90 up to $95--will become eligible, provided they meet all other eligibility conditions. State cost standards for AFDC have risen in purchasing value over the years of experience under the Social Security Act since 1940, although the improvement for AFDC has been considerably less than for other Federally aided assistance programs. In 1962, the average monthly assistance payment per AFDC family was $124, an increase of $91 in actual dollars since 1940 and $51 or 77 percent in purchasing value.

The largest part of the increase in most States has been made possible by increases in Federal financial participation as a result of a series of amendments to the Social Security Act effective in 1939, 1946, 1948, 1952, 1956 and 1958. The effect on caseloads of the resulting increases in assistance standards has been most substantial in certain low-income States with high incidence of poverty in their total populations. Increases in caseloads in these States will be discussed later in a section dealing with trends in individual State programs.

While the factors already discussed explain the sources of increases in the AFDC program, they still do not reveal the basic nature and extent of poverty in the United States that causes the dependency of so many of our children and their families. The most basic question to be asked and answered is not how much and why has AFDC grown but how good a job does it do, that is, to what extent does financial aid provided under AFDC meet the current problem of low income in our Nation?

Who Are the Poor in the United States? Why Are They Poor? How Many Do They Number? What Proportion of Them Are Aided by AFDC?

There is a growing literature, as concern increases, about the nature and extent of poverty in the United States. It is no purpose of this analysis to add yet another independent investigation of the matter.

Fortunately, an analysis recently completed within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provides some facts, estimates and hypotheses on poverty that are, of all yet undertaken, the ones most relevant to a discussion of the relationship of AFDC to possible total need for income support and supplement among all families with children. The quotations that follow are taken from an article presenting those estimates, "The Children of the Poor" by Mollie Orshansky, a member of the research staff of the Social Security Administration. 4/

Who are the poor? Why are they poor?

"It would be one thing if poverty hit at random and no one group were

---

4/ Orshansky, Mollie, "Children of the Poor", Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 26, No. 7, July 1963, pp. 3 and 4. The article includes a wealth of information on income status and distribution among families with children in the United States.

singled out. It is another thing to realize that some seem destined to poverty almost from birth--by their color or by the economic status or occupation of their parents. It has become a truism that in good times and in bad, certain groups lag behind in the long-term upswing of our economy. Prominent among these are the aged, the families headed by a woman, and minority groups--particularly the Negro.

"Year after year the same kinds of people continually appear at the bottom of the income pyramid. In 1961, for example, of the families in the lowest income group (the lowest 20 percent) almost a third were aged families, a fourth were broken families (usually headed by a woman) and a fifth were nonwhite--proportions identical with those in 1951.

"When yet another measure is used, the perennial plight of the disadvantaged is seen as even more severe. It has always been true in our society that economic well-being rests on earning power. Public support programs are generally for those unable to work or deprived of the earnings of the relative on whom they would be expected to rely. But opportunities for work are no longer what they were. In yesterday's world, jobs paid better if one was trained, but even an untrained worker could find a place and expect that in time his earnings would improve along with his skill. The highly educated man did better, but his numbers were few and even for him the starting salary was low.

"Today in large measure an automated economy demands an increasingly productive and skilled labor force. Jobs ask more and pay more from the outset, and the unskilled worker cannot hope to better himself much. He will remain as he started, in a low-paid job, if indeed he has a job at all. As a result, the composition of the group we call our poor is changing too. Once it included not only those able to earn little or nothing but a fair number who would improve their lot. As the higher education and increased skills called for in many modern-day jobs upgrade our labor force more and more, the ranks of the poor seem to be reserved for those families with heads not able or not permitted to qualify for the better-paying jobs--the retired, the women, and the nonwhites.

"... This segregation of the pocketbook can be illustrated by comparing families having less than $3,000 today and those of a decade ago, bearing in mind that this amount now is about half the average for all families but in 1951 represented four-fifths of average income. Only 1 out of every 5 families now has income this low, compared with 1 in every 3 then. Yet today more of these families are headed by a nonwhite or an aged person or by a woman...

"Some families of course, bear more than one of these stigmas. The low incomes of the aged are receiving much attention in existing and proposed programs. The broken families and nonwhite poor harbor a

disadvantaged group from the other end of the age spectrum--children under 18. By almost any standard of adequacy the number of children under-privileged by too low income is as large as, or larger than, the total aged population ..."

How many are the poor among families with children? Estimates of the number vary depending upon where criteria are set to separate deprivation from low income. The lowest estimates of the impoverished, however, still include from one-fifth to one-fourth of the Nation's children. Some of the highest estimates would put the proportion who are among the poor at two out of every five children. Miss Orshansky describes her estimates as follows:

"...By one crude index of poverty it can be shown that every fourth or fifth family with children under age 18 may have to choose between an adequate diet at minimum cost and some other necessity; they cannot afford both. All told, some 17-23 million youngsters, or from a fourth to a third of all our children, are growing up in the gray shadow of poverty." 5/

Miss Orshansky's "crude index of poverty" is based on low-cost and economy food budgets developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Her income bases for dividing the impoverished from the low-income (for which she gives a rationale in her article) are set at three times the cost of the USDA food budgets. The index used is particularly relevant to assessing AFDC's relationship to poverty because no State has an assistance standard of requirement that provides that much income. In fact, in 1958 --and standards have not improved so conspicuously since as to invalidate the study made in that year--only one State in the country has assistance standards that provided even as much as twice the income needed for a low-cost food budget under USDA standards. 6/ Thus all AFDC families are included in the number of families estimated to have too little to cover all the essential costs of daily living.

What is more, the estimates of the poor among kinds of families most frequently found on AFDC are even larger than those for all families. In about three of every four AFDC families, the father is dead or absent from the home for other reasons. Of particular concern relative to the AFDC program, therefore, is the number of poor families that are headed by women. Of additional concern are husband-wife families living below deprivation levels, particularly because of the recent extension of AFDC to families with unemployed parents but also because of the number of AFDC families in which both parents are in the home but one, usually the father, is incapacitated. Even in mother-father families, according to the above quoted estimates, at least one of every five children lives in poverty. Among families headed by the mother about four out of every five children --the large majority--are deprived.

5/ Ibid, p. 1

6/ Public Assistance: Report of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1960 Appendix B, "Financial Need Met by Public Assistance," p. 56.

What proportion of the poor are helped by AFDC? The grossness of the poverty in which the AFDC children would have lived without such aid is sufficiently demonstrated by the very fact that their families qualified as needy under State assistance standards for AFDC. As indicated above in relation to one standard and as could be demonstrated relative to even lower ones, State AFDC standards at best have never provided more than the barest minimum of funds to families. Thus to live on an AFDC assistance grant is to live in poverty. Yet to qualify for AFDC, families must have less income of their own than would be provided under these standards; in fact many AFDC families have no income other than their assistance grants. It is a safe assumption, therefore, that families receiving AFDC are not only poor but among the very poorest of the poor. The AFDC program makes visible the millions of our Nation's children who live in stark poverty as our society seldom sees them elsewhere. But a comparison of the millions of children on AFDC with the total number in impoverished families brings to mind the time-worn simile regarding the visibility of the iceberg. The proportion of the poor who are visible is disarmingly small compared to the size of the group who for the most part remain hidden from general view in our slums and on isolated farms, unknown and unaided.

Taking Miss Orshansky's lowest estimates of impoverished families and children in the United States described above, the AFDC program in December 1962 at best reached not quite one out of every six impoverished families and children in the Nation. Among impoverished families headed by women, the AFDC program had better coverage but still reached only about half. Among impoverished mother-father families, AFDC covered not quite 1 in 11 or 12--in considerable part, no doubt, because so few States provide aid to such families unless the father is incapacitated. In addition, however, while poor by any standard, more of the whole families than the broken families undoubtedly would be among the least poor of the very poor, while more of the broken families would be among the poorest of the poor, that is among those with so little income as to be less than State assistance standards for living requirements.

Under Federal law, all people must be free to apply for assistance, must receive prompt attention to their applications, and--if eligible under State law and policy--must be approved for assistance. From the relatively low incidence of receipt of AFDC among the Nation's impoverished families only a few conclusions are possible: that the assistance standards for AFDC are so inadequate as to cover only those in starkest need (as indicated above); that some State restrictive eligibility conditions, unrelated to financial need, condemn large numbers of needy children to gross poverty and deprivation; or that the large majority of the poor would prefer to exist as long as possible on almost nothing of their own than to apply for public aid. Since the poverty estimates were based on data covering all current income of these families, one cannot conclude that the majority of these families (except perhaps a few of those on farms who represent barely 1 in 10 of the estimated poor families) had other sources of income.

In any case, no matter how large the AFDC caseload may seem to the reluctant tax payer when it is compared with the early days of the program, AFDC's role in dealing with poverty obviously is very small compared with

the number of families in the United States whose incomes are wholly inadequate for decent and healthful living. With their poverty so gross, recognition of the need among these families for income support and/or for help to build their income potential--if not through AFDC, by some other means--would seem imperative if their poverty is not to serve to ensure its own perpetuity through the next generation and the next.

Despite the desperate financial condition of families served by AFDC and despite the overall growth in the program, most families leave the program before all their children have reached age 18, and the size of total caseloads varies from time to time.

What Economic Factors Influence AFDC Caseloads to Increase or Decrease?

In view of the depth of poverty of families eligible for AFDC, the AFDC program is almost incredibly responsive to seasonal and longer term upswings in the Nation's economy. Almost every summer, as seasonal opportunities for work become available, the AFDC caseload declines. Over the whole period of its history, the AFDC program has followed much the same pattern as unemployment rates (although with shallower up and down swings). Like unemployment rates, AFDC caseloads have increased with slackened economic activity and decreased with improvement in the Nation's economy. Also, as with unemployment rates, economic improvements following down swings have not been effective in bringing AFDC caseloads back to a level as low as before the economic slackening occurred. Thus, the phenomenon of the creeping--or leaping--size of the AFDC caseload has occurred in much the same pattern as the creeping rise to ever larger numbers of unemployed following each period of decreased economic activity.

For the segment of AFDC excluding families of unemployed parents, that is for families headed by women, proportionate changes in AFDC caseloads bear a somewhat closer relationship to trends in unemployment rates in service occupations than they do to total unemployment rates. (For example, from 1949 to 1950 unemployment rates in the service occupations increased while the total unemployment rate declined. AFDC caseloads also increased from 1949 to 1950.) This is not surprising considering that, of the almost 70 percent of AFDC mothers who have at some time held full- or part-time employment, more than three out of every five have been service workers--about half in private households; half, elsewhere. 7/

For the AFDC-UP segment of the AFDC caseload, that is for families of unemployed parents, caseload trends are even more responsive to seasonal upswings in employment than is the rest of the caseload. While the period of experience with AFDC-UP coverage is not long enough to test the assumption, presumably the AFDC-UP segment will also be somewhat more sensitive than the rest of the AFDC caseload to longer term changes in the economy, especially to changes in employment rates among the unskilled and

---

7/ For these and further details on characteristics of AFDC families, see Mugge, Robert H., "Aid to Families with Dependent Children: Initial Findings of the 1961 Report on Characteristics of Recipients", Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 26, No. 3, March 1963, p. 3.

the semi-skilled. Of all fathers in AFDC families for whom a usual occupation was known the AFDC-UP fathers probably represent the largest proportion. Among all AFDC fathers, about one-third are unskilled workers and another 1 in 7 are operatives and kindred semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Unemployment rates among these workers, of course, are among the highest of all occupations. In addition, such workers are greatly affected by seasonal changes in labor demands. As available jobs demand more skills, these are the workers who do and will contribute most heavily to the continuing upward trend in the total number of unemployed and to growing welfare rolls, unless something is done to correct their lacks in basic education and skills.

In short, while AFDC has always been responsive to changes in the total economy, the AFDC families come from the "hard-core" unemployed of the Nation. The Department of Labor lists five groups who are most frequently and most durably represented among the unemployed. The following three of these groups also are those most frequently represented among AFDC families. They are:

1. Youth, among whom school "dropouts" have among the highest chance of being unemployed; one in four of those who do not have a high school diploma also do not have jobs.

In AFDC families, unemployed fathers are young (half are under 35 years of age); more importantly, nine out of ten have not finished high school; more than half have not gone beyond 8th grade. Incapacitated fathers in AFDC families are in even worse case so far as education goes. More than two in every five have less than five years of schooling; more than four out of five have no more than an 8th grade education.

2. Unskilled, half of whom are among the long-term unemployed.

The lack of job skills among AFDC fathers and mothers has already been noted.

3. Negroes, who represent 10 percent of the American labor force, 20 percent of all unemployed, and 25 percent of the long-term unemployed.

Among AFDC families, about two out of every five are Negro, while among all families with children, about one in ten is Negro. Among several large urban areas, where Negroes represent from 2½ percent to about 54 percent of the total population, they represent no less than 17 percent and as much as 93 percent of all AFDC families.

It is because these facts demonstrate the very small chance of employment open to families who receive AFDC that the response of the AFDC program to economic changes--even as moderate as that response often tends to be--was earlier described as almost incredible. Yet the AFDC program has always been one of relatively rapid turnover in the caseload. To understand why, it is helpful to look at figures on the number of applications received and approved and the numbers of cases closed, along with the reasons given for opening and closing cases.

Why do people come on assistance rolls? Why do they leave? The average AFDC case at the time of a recent survey (late calendar year 1961) had been on assistance a little more than 25 months since it was last opened for financial assistance. Many families, however, receive continuous assistance for less than a full year following approval to receive aid.

Trends in applications approved and in cases closed--for both AFDC-UP families and others, but particularly for families of unemployed parents--are even more responsive to general economic and to seasonal trends than are trends in the number of families receiving assistance. Consistently from 1940 to 1962, the number of applications received and approved in total from year to year have exceeded the number of cases closed; hence the general upward trend in total families receiving aid. Only during World War II and the Korean hostilities did applications approved fall below case closures in December of any year. From 1953, however, closures exceeded openings by a wide margin in June of each year except in 1958 and 1961, both years of relatively higher unemployment. Thus the June and December figures on these two measures of program movement also serve to confirm the strong effect that greater summer employment opportunities have both on keeping people off assistance and in helping them to leave assistance rolls. Since only a few agencies automatically close AFDC cases on presumption of opportunities for summer employment, the usual summer decrease in families applying for and receiving aid is also a cogent demonstration of an eagerness for self-support and independence that exists even among those American families whose opportunities for any employment, and whose chances for a decent wage if employed, are the lowest our economy offers.

What happens in families that compels them to seek public aid? In most cases (four out of five) the families in the months before applying for aid have taken an additional step down in the income scale. For more than half of those families to whom such a decrease in income leads to application for assistance, earnings of a family member have been lost or reduced because of illness or injury, job lay-off or discharge, or a similar reason. For an additional one out of five families applying, the decrease in income follows departure from the home of a mother, father, or other responsible adult, who had previously provided support.

When are cases closed? Just as families come on assistance rolls because they lose income, they leave, most frequently, because their income increases, although a smaller proportion of cases are closed for this reason than are opened because resources become more limited. In more than one of every three cases closed, the mother, the father, a child, or some other person in the family has found employment with wages at least high enough to put the family income above State assistance standards. In another one out of eight closed cases, the family's income increases when the absent parent returns, the mother remarries, or someone outside the home undertakes to help the family.

The poor family's desire for independence, often tended and fed, it is true, by workers of the public assistance agencies, becomes even more evident among the families of unemployed parents--those presumably with greatest opportunity and equipment for employment among all AFDC families. In June 1962, for example--a summer month--of about 9,200 AFDC-UP cases closed, more than three out of five were closed because a parent obtained employment, usually on his own initiative. In December 1962--a winter month--fewer AFDC-UP cases were closed (about 4,000) but still three out of five were closed because a parent obtained employment.

So far, this analysis has dealt entirely with the AFDC program as it appears for the Nation as a whole. What of the individual States? For answers to this question the last section of the analysis will consider individual State trends in caseloads since 1940.

How do AFDC trends vary among individual States? Because each individual State defines the scope of its public assistance programs within only broad limits set by the Federal Act, the truest of all generalizations about public assistance is: it varies among States. Trends in the total number of AFDC families aided since 1940, however, indicate that the variations follow common patterns among groups of States that share common social and economic characteristics. One of the most influential characteristics is the relative wealth of the State which also inversely indicates the relative incidence of low income. Another important characteristic is the extent to which the State has been affected in its population growth and makeup by the increased mobility of Americans, particularly among the poor during and since World War II. 8/

All States increased their assistance standards between 1940 and 1962. The average payment per family in 1962 was about two times the 1940 average in the State with the lowest increase; the 1962 average was more than nine times the 1940 amount in the State with the highest increase. As a result, all States, presumably, made assistance available to more of their families in 1962 than in 1940. If so, all States should have been aiding a larger number of families in 1962 than in 1940. However, income and population changes have varied among States, and so have changes in total caseloads. Over the years, three distinct patterns of caseload trends have occurred as follows:

I. Caseloads doubled or more from the 1940's in 29 States. In six of these States the number of families aided in December 1962 was at least five times the number aided in the 40's. This group of States is about equally divided between those with average per capita income below the National median and those with above median income. The reasons for the large increases in caseload differ for the two per capita income groups.

Among the lower income States are those where poverty is so widespread that substantial increases in assistance standards such as have been made over the almost quarter century since 1940 will inevitably result in substantial increases in caseloads, no matter how limited the defined scope of eligibility may be. Most of these non-industrial States have lost substantial numbers of people on the move for wider opportunity in industrial centers, but large proportions of their populations who remain are very poor, as the per capita incomes in the States indicate. All these States are aiding considerably more families than they did in

8/ Increase of in-migration or out-migration of relatively poor populations has been hypothesized on the basis of the changes between 1940 and 1960 in the proportions of total population who are Negro.

1940; all but one are aiding a larger proportion of their children. The lower-income States in this group are as follows:

A. States among the lowest 13 in per capita income:

Mississippi	Georgia	South Carolina
Kentucky	West Virginia	
Alabama	North Carolina	

B. Other States below the National median in per capita income:

Florida	New Mexico	Virginia
Arizona	Maine	
Iowa	Vermont	

Among the higher-income States where caseloads at least doubled are most of the large industrial States, which have experienced substantial in-migration of poor populations since 1940, especially in their large urban and metropolitan centers. In most of these States, substantial proportions of the population have comfortable or even better incomes, but the city slums have burgeoned in the past 20 years and now house many migrants of the 40's and 50's who came seeking better opportunity but are not equipped to meet the demands in education and skill of today's industrial jobs. All these States aid substantially more AFDC families than they did in 1940; all but one aid larger proportions of children in their populations. The higher-income States in the group are the following:

A. States among the highest 13 in per capita income:

Alaska	Nevada	New York
California	Delaware	Washington
Connecticut	Illinois	New Jersey
District of Columbia	Ohio	

B. Other States above the National median in per capita income:

Rhode Island	Hawaii
Oregon	Missouri

II. Relatively smaller increases in the number of families receiving AFDC occurred in 13 other States, where 1962 caseloads were from about 10 percent to 90 percent higher than in 1940 or the first year thereafter that aid was given under a Federal-State program. Five of the 13 States are below the National median in per capita income; 7 are above and one is at the median.

No doubt some of the relatively smaller caseload increases in several of the lower-income States are due to the influence of limiting eligibility conditions unrelated to financial need, so that even though each of the States had substantially increased assistance standards, the proportion of all children aided has increased only slightly or has decreased since

1940. Most of these States, in addition, tend to be among those who lose poor and upward seeking populations with increased population mobility. The five lower-income States among the 13 are as follows:

A. States among the lowest 13 in per capita income:

South Dakota Louisiana
Tennessee

B. Other States below National median in per capita income:

Texas Utah

Of the higher-income States with relatively small caseload increases, very few have become homes of sizeable poor in-migrant populations. For this reason and because their populations are generally among the better-off economically, the relatively small increase in families aided also represented relatively small changes or even sizeable decreases in the proportion of children aided. These States included the following:

A. States among the highest 13 in per capita income:

Maryland Massachusetts

B. States at or above the National median in per capita income:

Michigan	Pennsylvania	Wyoming
New Hampshire	Colorado	Minnesota

III. In 9 States, the number of AFDC families in 1962 was about the same as in 1940 or was actually smaller. The nine States include six States below the National median in per capita income and three above. Of these States, all but two are primarily agricultural and most have been relatively little affected by incoming poor migrant populations. The number of families decreased in seven of the nine States; the proportion of all children aided also decreased in all but two. Except for one or two in which eligibility conditions are limited, these States, it would appear, may well have smaller poor populations than they did some 20 years ago, when the country was just emerging from the great depression. The nine States in this group were as follows:

A. States among the lowest 13 in per capita income:

Arkansas Idaho North Dakota

B. Other States below the National median in per capita income:

Kansas Oklahoma Montana

C. States among the highest 13 in per capita income: None

D. Other States above the National median in per capita income:

Wisconsin Nebraska Indiana

The patterns into which the individual State trends fall lead to the conclusion that, whether eligibility conditions are defined to limit the proportion of the financially needy population who will be aided or to open assistance rolls to a broader group of the States' poorest citizens, all State programs are more powerfully affected by the following factors outside the control of State agencies than by any decisions made by the States about eligibility conditions:

1. The considerably greater number of poor families with children in all States than AFDC has ever reached.
2. The extent to which each State is urbanized and industrialized and thus has become a home for those seeking a better life and wider opportunity.
3. The effect of the necessity for increasing assistance standards as costs and standards of living rise for all Americans.

These three factors, indeed, explain the growth and development of the AFDC program. As individual States cannot escape the consequences of these influences, neither can the Nation. In fact, a fourth necessity deriving from basic values and forces in our society needs further consideration in future development and growth in both the scope and assistance levels of the AFDC program. This necessity is that of preserving and protecting the right of all children to a healthful and decent life and to equal opportunity to make the most of their abilities. The Nation needs their well-being and contributions for its own progress and growth. In addition, we cannot afford the social and economic consequences and costs of allowing so many of our children to live under conditions that practically, if not inevitably, preclude a self-supporting adulthood for most of them.

DELINQUENCY AND CRIME PROJECTS

The Summer 1963 edition of Current Projects in the Prevention, Control, and Treatment of Crime and Delinquency compiled by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency contains reports of 419 Current Projects and a list of Continuing Projects first reported in Volume I of this series. Each report is described by title, project director, project address, auspices, date began and completed, publications, and summary of findings or study design. This volume also contains three short introductory notes on the current international situation in criminology.

The Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963

Summary and Legislative History

The Mills-Ribicoff bill--the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963"--became law on October 24, 1963, when President Kennedy signed the legislation. In a message issued when he signed Public Law 88-156, the President said, in part:

> "It will initiate a new program of comprehensive maternity and infant care, aimed directly at preventing mental retardation. It will help arouse local communities to a major attack on the problems of mental retardation . . . .
>
> "Enactment of this legislation is, therefore, an important landmark in our drive to eliminate one of the major health hazards affecting mankind. We can say with some assurance, that although children may be the victims of fate, they will not be the victims of our neglect."

The new law will do much to assist in providing health services designed to reduce the incidence of mental retardation and to provide health services for mentally retarded children. A major part of the funds authorized will be expended specifically for such services. However, by expanding the general programs of maternal and child health and crippled children's services and by authorizing applied research related to these programs, the bill should contribute significantly to preventive health services for mothers and children and be of benefit to children with all types of handicapping conditions who would not otherwise receive needed medical care.

Summary of Public Law 88-156

The new law contains five major provisions:

1. It increases the $25 million ceiling on the authorization for the Federal-State program of maternal and child health services to $30 million for fiscal 1964; $35 million for 1965; $40 million for 1966 and 1967; $45 million for 1968 and 1969; and $50 million for 1970 and subsequent years.
2. It makes the same increases in the $25 million ceiling authorized for the Federal-State program of crippled children's services.
3. It authorizes a new 5 year program of grants to public health agencies for projects to provide necessary health care for expectant mothers who have, or are likely to have, conditions associated with child-

---

By Wilbur J. Cohen and Charles E. Hawkins. Mr. Cohen is an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Mr. Hawkins is Legislative Reference Officer of the Welfare Administration.

bearing that increase hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants and who, because of low income or other reasons beyond their control, as determined by the State or local health agency will not receive such care. Authorizations are $5 million for fiscal 1964, $15 million for 1965, and $30 million each for 1966, 1967, and 1968. The Federal grant cannot exceed 75 percent of the cost of a project.

4. It authorizes grants, contracts, or jointly financed cooperative arrangements for research projects related to maternal and child health services or crippled children's services that show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement of these programs. Appropriations cannot exceed $8 million for any fiscal year.

5. It authorizes a one-time appropriation of $2.2 million to States to assist in: developing public awareness of the problems of mental retardation, coordinating existing resources, and planning other activities leading to State and community action to combat mental retardation. The Federal grant cannot cover more than 75 percent of the cost of a State's proposed planning and other activities.

Cost of the Legislation

The cost of Public Law 88-156, estimated at the time the legislation was being considered, was $19.2 million for fiscal 1964, increasing to $78 million in fiscal 1968--a cumulative cost of $265 million for the first five years. For subsequent years, the law authorizes increased expenditures of $48 million in fiscal 1969 and of $58 million each year thereafter.

As the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives states:

> "There are approximately 5.4 million mentally retarded persons in the population. About 126,000 mentally retarded children are born each year. The costs of mental retardation are high both in terms of dollars and human suffering. Many of the severely mentally retarded require substantial lifetime care in institutions. Others contribute to the population of our jails and welfare institutions. One of the greatest burdens both in dollars and in human misery results from the longtime care of the mentally retarded in their own homes. The cost of institutional care, facilities construction, and special care in the family is estimated at more than $1 billion per year. Payments for mentally retarded persons under the public assistance and the social security programs amounted to about $100 million in the fiscal year 1963.
>
> "Significant reductions in these burdens to families, to States and localities, and to our society as a whole amply justify increased expenditures that will prevent and reduce mental retardation as a social and economic problem."1/

1/ H.R. Report 657, 88th Cong., 1st sess., p.9.

Background of the Legislation

All of the provisions of the law are related to recommendations made by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. This Panel under the chairmanship of Leonard Mayo was appointed by the President on October 17, 1961, and submitted its report, "A Proposed Program for National Action to Combat Mental Retardation," on October 16, 1962. The Panel's report gave particular emphasis to the need for the provision for special maternity grants based on the high incidence of premature babies born to mothers, usually in low income families, who had high risks of complications of pregnancy. The proportion of premature infants who are mentally retarded very substantially exceeds the proportion of infants born at full term who are mentally retarded. This provision of the bill is accordingly a key feature of the program to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications of childbearing and the number of premature births among which there are a notably larger number of damaged and retarded infants.

During the consideration of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 under which progressive increases in the program of child welfare services were authorized, a number of groups urged comparable increases in the amounts authorized for maternal and child health services and crippled children's services. The justification for such increases stem not only from mental retardation but from continuing increases in the child population, in the cost of medical care, and from wide variations among States in maternal and infant mortality. Advances in medical technology which are of benefit to handicapped children further justify an increase in appropriations for that program.

The authorization for research projects designed to improve the operation of the programs of maternal and child health services and crippled children's services rounds out authority contained in the Act of April 9, 1912, establishing the Children's Bureau and authorizing research in matters pertaining to the welfare of children and childlife.2/

The provision of the new law for one-time grants to States for planning and other activities necessary for comprehensive action in the States and communities to combat mental retardation will afford an opportunity for States to review and appraise their existing resources in this field and to make plans for filling existing gaps in the light of the comprehensive recommendations made by the President's Panel. The relatively small grants, averaging about $40,000 per State, are designed to assure that all of the activities in the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and the law, and services provided through community

---

2/ The authorization under the 1912 Act did not extend to grants and contracts for such research. Legislation to accomplish the extension was introduced in the 87th Congress by Congressman Mills in the House of Representatives and by the late Senator Kerr and Senator Hill in the Senate. This legislation had not been acted on when the 87th Congress adjourned, however.

programs and institutions for the mentally retarded will be involved.

Legislative History

Executive hearings were held on the legislation in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. No recorded votes were taken in either body. The House Ways and Means Committee took what Chairman Mills described in the floor debate as "something here I do not recall ever having been done before in the development of legislation. We have gone to the source of more knowledge than perhaps we possess, I must admit, the Appropriations Committee members of the House, to get their advice and their assurance."3/ As a result of these discussions, committee amendments were offered and later adopted on the House floor.

On February 5, 1963, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a special message on "Mental Illness and Mental Retardation." This was the first time any President ever sent a special message to the Congress on this subject. In his message he pointed out:

> "The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have--as in the case of mental illness--been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset--our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults--an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families."

On the same day (February 5, 1963) Congressman Mills, Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, introduced H.R. 3386 to carry out those recommendations in the President's message which involved amendment of Title V--the maternal and child health and welfare title of the Social Security Act and establishment of a new title of that Act. On March 14, 1963, Senator Ribicoff introduced S. 1072--a companion bill--in the Senate. Other recommendations of the President relating to mental health and mental retardation, which came within the jurisdiction of Committees other than Ways and Means in the House and Finance in the Senate, were the subject of separate bills by other members of Congress.

3/ Source: Congressional Record, August 27, 1963, p. 15159.

House Consideration and Action

The House Committee on Ways and Means, in which legislation to amend the Social Security Act traditionally starts, had a very heavy program in its consideration of the President's tax program. It was in no position to schedule public hearings on H.R. 3386 at an early date. Accordingly, on March 25, 1963, Chairman Mills issued a press release inviting the views of interested organizations and individuals for the purpose of determining whether the legislation was controversial in character and whether public hearings were necessary. A total of 115 letters conveying the views of 125 organizations were received. These included national organizations in the health and medical field and, in nonmedical areas, the views of State, county and city health departments, of associations for retarded children, of deans, professors and heads of departments of schools of medicine and public health, of members of Congress, etc. Only two of the letters were from individuals not representing an organization or institution. Of the 115 letters, 113 expressed approval of the measure. One favored some provisions but not others, and one expressed disapproval because this individual believed that the job should be done by private charity. These comments together with an analysis were compiled into a printed document issued by the Committee on Ways and Means in June 1963.

On June 26, 1963, the Committee met in an executive session at which time the bill was explained, the comments considered, and a determination made that public hearings were not necessary.

On July 11, 1963, the Committee again met in an executive session and considered the provisions of H.R. 3386. Two modifications were made by the Committee: (1) a ceiling of $8 million for any fiscal year was placed on the authorization for research grants; and (2) a limitation of 75 percent was placed on the Federal share of expenditures for planning grants. With these changes, it was agreed that the Chairman should introduce a clean bill.

On July 15, 1963, Chairman Mills introduced H.R. 7544 embodying the provisions of H.R. 3386 as modified by Committee consideration.

On July 30, 1963, the Ways and Means Committee considered H.R. 7544 and ordered it reported with Committee amendments. These amendments stemmed from discussions with members of the House Appropriations Committee. They made the following additional changes: (1) they made clear that in the special maternity projects the State's or locality's 25 percent share could not include items of general overhead of the health department sponsoring project; (2) references to "all necessary health care" were modified to read "necessary health care;" (3) a provision that qualified persons who were otherwise unlikely to receive care was modified to require a determination by the State or local health agency that they would not receive necessary health care because of low income or for other reasons beyond their control; (4) authorization to make research grants to or contracts with agencies was limited to nonprofit agencies and authorization for contracts with individuals was eliminated.

On August 5, 1963, the Ways and Means Committee submitted its report.

On August 22, 1963, a rule was granted permitting two hours debate with amendments to the bill or to Title V but not to other titles of the Social Security Act.

On August 27, 1963, H.R. 7544 was debated in the House of Representatives and passed by a voice vote without amendments other than the Committee amendments.

Senate Action

On October 1, 1963, the Senate Committee on Finance considered H.R. 7544 in an executive session and adopted one amendment. The provision for planning grants requires that there be a single State agency responsible. In response to a question in the House debate, Congressman Mills had given assurance that the single State agency might be an interdepartmental committee. The Senate Finance Committee amendment made it explicit in the statute that an interdepartmental agency might serve. With this amendment the Committee ordered the bill reported and filed its report later that same day.

On the following day, October 2, 1963, following an explanation of the bill by Senator Ribicoff for the Senate Committee on Finance, the bill was approved by the Senate without debate by a voice vote.

On October 15, 1963, the House by unanimous consent concurred in the Senate amendment thereby clearing the bill for the President, who signed it on October 24, 1963.

NATIONAL TRENDS IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, 1953-62

The increased volume of R & D expenditures in the United States is one manifestation of the scientific orientation of our society. Over the ten years since 1953-54, the nation spent about $100 billion on research and development. For the previous ten years, the national R & D expenditure is estimated to have been from about $25 to $30 billion. Details of these and other changes in expenditures for research and development in the United States are reported by the National Science Foundation in "Reviews of Data on Research and Development", Number 41, September 1963. Of the $15 billion spent for research and development in 1961-62, 65 percent came from the Federal government, 32 percent from industry, 2 percent from colleges and universities, and 1 percent from other non-profit institutions. Industry was the largest consumer of such funds (74 percent), followed by the Federal government (14 percent), colleges and universities (9 percent), and other non-profit institutions (3 percent). Sixty-eight percent of all 1961-62 R & D funds were used for development activities, 22 percent went into applied research, and 10 percent was devoted to basic research. Cross tabulations are provided by sources of funds, uses of funds, and types of research and development activity. Data are not given, however, by fields of research such as the natural, biological and behavioral sciences.

Publications of Interest*

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

International Cooperation: The Contribution of the Welfare Administration. WA Publication No. 2. Welfare Administration, 1963. 9 pp. 15 cents. Describes cooperative activities with the UN, OAS, and other organizations; training services provided to foreign visitors; technical consultation to other countries; information exchange; and cooperative research.

Children and Neglect; Hazardous Home Conditions. By Claire Hancock. Bureau of Family Services, 1963. 59 pp. 40 cents. Offers criteria for evaluating home conditions that may be hazardous to children. Focuses on the needs of parents and children and on the circumstances which place responsibility on the public welfare agency to intervene to protect the children.

Aid to Families With Dependent Children. Bureau of Family Services, 1963. A folder presenting the basic facts about AFDC: its purpose, how a family applies for AFDC, how family need is measured, the responsibilities of the family and the agency, the proportion of the nation's children receiving AFDC, and length of time families receive aid.

Basic Reference Books and Journals in Gerontology. OA No. 306 in the "Selected References on Aging" series. Office of Aging, 1963. 11 pp. Major reference works selected by teachers and researchers in gerontology to guide university libraries.

Income of Older People, 1960-61. By Herman B. Brotman. OA No. 407 in the "Facts on Aging" series. Office of Aging, September 1963. 15 pp. Tabular and analytical presentation of level and trends of income of older persons and families and of related social and economic characteristics.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Services for Families Living in Public Housing. Prepared by Committee on Use of Program Resources, Joint Task Force on Health, Education, and Welfare Services and Housing. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Home Finance Agency, July 1963. 67 pp. Available upon request to the Bureau of Family Services. Deals with the major social problems of concern to residents of public housing and offers practical guides for the use and coordination of resources provided through federally aided programs.

---

* U.S. Government publications for which prices are listed may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Inquiries or orders for other publications should be directed to the publisher or issuing agency.

Counter-Attack on Delinquency. President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, September 1963. 83 pp. Describes the program of the Federal Government to stimulate communities to develop rational answers to a growing crisis. Includes reports of how 16 cities are combatting delinquency with the aid of Juvenile Delinquency Act funds.

Guide for Board Organization and Administrative Structure. By E. Elizabeth Glover. Child Welfare League of America, New York, 1963. 34 pp. $1.

Mental Retardation Activities of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963. 119 pp. 75 cents.

Mental Retardation: A National Plan for a National Problem; Chart Book. President's Panel on Mental Retardation, 1963. 69 pp. 45 cents.

The Study of Society, A Unified Approach. By Alfred Kuhn. Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1963. 810 pp. $11.35.

Social Dependency in the San Francisco Bay Area: Today and Tomorrow. By Margaret Greenfield. Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 1963. 65 pp.

American Women. President's Commission on the Status of Women, 1963. 86 pp. $1.25. Report of the commission.

Aging and the Economy. Edited by Harold L. Orbach and Clark Tibbitts. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1963. 237 pp. $7.50. Papers, addresses, and major panel discussions presented at the University of Michigan's 15th annual conference on aging held in Ann Arbor, June 18-20, 1962. This year's conference was on the reciprocal relationships between the national economy and the increasing older population.

A Full Life After 65. By Edith M. Stern. Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 347. Public Affairs Committee, New York, 1963. 28 pp. 25 cents. Discusses psychological and practical problems that people face after retirement.

Buildings for the Elderly. By Noverre Musson and Helen Heusinkveld. Reinhold Publishing Corp., New York, 1963. 216 pp. $15. Analyzes housing needs of the elderly, defines terms, gives architectural checklist and plans, describes housing projects and homes in U.S. and abroad.

"Rehabilitating the Aging Disabled Worker." Rehabilitation Record, September-October 1963, pp. 2-16. Published by Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Reprints free. Five articles tell how a New York agency found solutions to the problems of many aging disabled persons and how these solutions are being applied in other parts of the country.

Program and Operating Statistics

Total PA Recipient Load Rises Slightly in August

The downward movement in the number of recipients of public assistance that started last April was halted in August, when the total went up 7,200 to more than 7.5 million. The largest change--an increase of 8,300 or 5.9 percent--was in medical assistance for the aged. The number of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled rose 3,800 or 0.8 percent. In August, for the first time in several months, there were slightly more recipients of old-age assistance and aid to the blind than in the preceding month. Two-thirds of the increase in the program for the aged and the entire rise in aid to the blind resulted from vendor medical payments made during August in behalf of persons who had left the assistance rolls earlier.

The number of recipients of aid to families with dependent children declined by 6,000 or 0.2 percent, reflecting mainly the decrease of 11,200 in families aided because of a parent's unemployment. August was the fourth consecutive month in which the total number of recipients under that program declined. The number of individuals receiving general assistance also continued to drop (by 2,400 or 0.3 percent in August) but the number of cases went up slightly.

Assistance payments for all six programs, including vendor payments for medical care, rose $757,000 to $391.2 million. Total payments for medical assistance for the aged rose $1.2 million or 4.3 percent, and changes in payments under each of the other five programs were relatively slight.

The average payment per recipient declined from $203 to $200 in medical assistance for the aged and changed by less than $1 in the other programs. Among the States, most of the noticeable changes in average payments under all Federally aided programs resulted from fluctuations in vendor payments for medical care of recipients. In Kansas, some recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled had an additional allowance of $12 for special needs included in their assistance budgets; the average money payment per recipient rose $5.71.

Tables:

	Page
Data on number of public assistance recipients and amounts of payments, August 1963.....	25-36
OASDI benefits, summary data, August 1963..	37

Table 1. Number of recipients of public assistance in the United States, by month, August 1962-August 1963 1/

to drop (by 2,400 or 0.3 percent in August) but

OASDI benefits, summary data, August 1963.. 37

Table 1. Number of recipients of public assistance in the United States, by month, August 1962-August 1963 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes cases receiving only vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Old-age assistance 2/	Medical assistance for the aged 2/	Aid to the blind 2/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 2/	Aid to families with dependent children			General assistance 4/	
					Families	Total recipients 3/	Children	Cases	Recipients
	Number of recipients								
1962									
August.....	2,228,434	109,312	100,016	420,476	928,503	3,635,693	2,808,942	329,000	796,000
September..	2,225,954	105,217	100,010	423,385	925,179	3,633,155	2,810,053	320,000	777,000
October....	2,229,059	114,657	99,928	427,312	926,851	3,732,081	2,809,210	326,000	790,000
November...	2,227,041	111,828	99,808	434,735	931,408	3,771,844	2,838,650	333,000	821,000
December...	2,226,194	109,732	99,583	437,453	942,635	3,825,517	2,871,760	354,000	899,000
1963									
January....	2,221,593	116,587	99,509	439,405	959,258	3,911,515	2,927,402	384,000	1,006,000
February...	2,217,499	116,682	99,136	442,251	967,355	3,957,218	2,960,451	390,000	1,038,000
March.....	2,214,441	117,508	98,845	445,854	975,629	3,990,393	2,984,095	387,000	1,020,000
April.....	2,211,016	127,412	98,588	448,448	977,739	4,004,001	2,995,563	371,000	941,000
May.....	2,202,503	129,493	98,457	459,236	972,468	3,976,318	2,978,716	348,000	852,000
June.....	2,198,896	136,220	98,390	461,537	962,597	3,934,542	2,952,013	329,000	775,000
July.....	2,190,856	140,159	98,084	466,357	957,794	3,918,326	2,938,506	325,000	769,000
August.....	2,194,301	148,467	98,141	470,155	955,014	3,912,364	2,933,517	326,000	767,000
	Percentage change from previous month								
1962									
August.....	-0.2	+7.3	-0.2	+0.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	-0.2
September..	-.1	-3.7	(5/)	+.7	-.4	-.1	(6/)	-2.7	-2.4
October....	+.1	+9.0	-.1	+.9	+.2	+2.7	(5/)	+1.6	+1.7
November...	-.1	-2.5	-.1	+1.7	+.5	+1.1	+1.0	+2.3	+3.9
December...	(5/)	-1.9	-.2	+.6	+1.2	+1.4	+1.2	+6.2	+9.5
1963									
January....	-.2	+6.2	-.1	+.4	+1.8	+2.2	+1.9	+8.7	+11.9
February...	-.2	+.1	-.4	+.6	+.8	+1.2	+1.1	+1.4	+3.2
March.....	-.1	+.7	-.3	+.8	+.9	+.8	+.8	-.6	-1.7
April.....	-.2	+8.4	-.3	+.6	+.2	+.3	+.4	-4.2	-7.8
May.....	-.4	+1.6	-.1	+2.4	-.5	-.7	-.6	-6.1	-9.4
June.....	-.2	+5.2	-.1	+.9	-1.0	-1.1	-.9	-5.6	-9.0
July.....	-.4	+2.9	-.3	+1.0	-.5	-.4	-.5	-1.2	-.8
August.....	+.2	+5.9	+.1	+.8	-.3	-.2	-.2	+.3	-.3

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Represents data for recipients of the specified type of assistance both under separate and combined State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 3/ Before October 1962, includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance; beginning October 1962, may include both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana; data not available. 5/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 2. Amount of public assistance payments in the United States, by month, August 1962-August 1963 1/

[Except for general assistance, includes vendor payments for medical care]

Year and month	Total 2/	Old-age assistance 3/	Medical assistance for the aged 3/	Aid to the blind 3/	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled 3/	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance 4/
	Amount of assistance						
1962							
August	$370,598,000	$162,742,516	$23,431,488	$7,848,529	$30,314,645	$114,946,953	$22,429,000
September	365,417,000	161,920,146	21,240,639	7,678,694	30,390,687	114,373,330	21,091,000
October	378,265,000	167,937,837	24,225,415	7,920,447	31,664,230	116,120,821	21,813,000
November	376,922,000	167,138,102	22,712,013	7,942,394	31,862,827	116,451,727	22,314,000
December	381,944,000	167,969,978	22,514,900	7,992,058	32,148,952	118,745,316	23,657,000
1963							
January	391,209,000	168,828,792	25,036,154	7,970,875	32,589,133	121,309,540	26,354,000
February	389,906,000	168,448,837	22,696,442	7,971,860	32,893,149	122,423,346	26,198,000
March	396,449,000	169,787,562	23,824,718	8,045,621	33,436,893	125,231,254	26,357,000
April	399,198,000	170,660,914	26,441,100	8,044,895	34,071,522	125,534,737	25,298,000
May	399,349,000	171,464,001	28,870,692	8,049,211	34,529,977	124,204,346	23,236,000
June	390,941,000	169,416,085	26,592,866	8,040,719	34,523,871	121,770,120	21,313,000
July	390,487,000	168,081,430	28,426,914	8,043,679	35,105,811	120,616,307	21,402,000
August	391,244,000	167,108,836	29,642,507	8,009,148	35,424,029	121,197,927	21,370,000
	Percentage change from previous month						
1962							
August	+0.9	-0.4	+11.1	+1.1	+1.3	+0.6	+1.7
September	-1.4	-.5	-9.4	-2.2	+.3	-.5	-6.0
October	+3.5	+3.7	+14.1	+3.1	+4.2	+1.5	+3.4
November	-.4	-.5	-6.2	+.3	+.6	+.3	+2.3
December	+1.3	+.5	-.9	+.6	+.9	+2.0	+6.0
1963							
January	+2.4	+.5	+11.2	-.3	+1.4	+2.2	+11.4
February	-.3	-.2	-9.3	(5/)	+.9	+.9	-.6
March	+1.7	+.8	+5.0	+.9	+1.7	+2.3	+.6
April	+.7	+.5	+11.0	(6/)	+1.9	+.2	-4.0
May	(5/)	+.5	+9.2	+.1	+1.3	-1.1	-8.1
June	-2.1	-1.2	-7.9	-.1	(6/)	-2.0	-8.3
July	-.1	-.8	+6.9	(5/)	+1.7	-.9	+.4
August	+.2	-.6	+4.3	-.4	+.9	+.5	-.2

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Total exceeds sum of columns because of inclusion of vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds; data for such expenditures partly estimated for some States. 3/ Represents data for payments to recipients of the specified type of assistance both under separate and combined State programs for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 4/ Partly estimated. Excludes Idaho and Indiana; data not available. 5/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 3. Old-age assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	July 1963 in--		August 1962 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/....	2,194,301	$167,108,836	$76.16	+0.2	-0.6	-1.5	+2.7
Ala.....	107,127	7,223,005	67.42	+.5	-.2	+5.1	+10.7
Alaska.....	1,438	3/ 116,946	81.33	+3.1	+2.2	+5.5	+20.0
Ariz.....	13,347	829,192	62.13	+.4	+.8	-1.9	-.1
Ark.....	57,446	3,683,885	64.13	+.8	-.4	+3.4	+16.2
Calif.....	265,690	28,547,573	107.45	+.7	-.1	+3.2	+5.8
Colo 2/.....	49,376	5,167,119	104.65	+.5	+1.7	+.7	+3.3
Conn.....	8,574	722,146	84.23	-.1	+7.6	-9.8	-7.7
Del.....	1,095	69,372	63.35	+1.4	-3.2	-2.1	+26.3
D. C.....	2,554	222,215	87.01	-6.2	-16.2	-12.3	-6.9
Fla. 4/.....	70,907	4,506,621	63.56	+.2	+2.0	+.8	+5.5
Ga.....	92,149	5,029,914	54.58	+.1	-.8	-1.2	+9.0
Guam 5/.....	161	4,289	26.64	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 4/.....	1,153	81,859	71.00	+.3	+9.6	-2.8	+10.6
Idaho.....	5,129	368,055	71.76	-1.0	-4.6	-9.6	-10.4
Ill.....	61,586	5,301,026	86.08	-.2	-.1	-6.4	-2.6
Ind.....	23,836	1,798,104	75.44	-.1	-.8	-4.2	+3.3
Iowa.....	29,795	2,659,057	89.25	-.3	-1.8	-5.3	+5.5
Kans.....	24,370	2,218,107	91.02	-.5	-.9	-5.1	-1.2
Ky.....	54,677	3,327,641	60.86	+.8	+2.7	+1.1	+13.9
La.....	128,558	10,266,119	79.86	+.2	-2.2	+1.7	+4.4
Maine.....	11,162	891,722	79.89	-.4	-.1	+.5	+7.5
Md.....	9,380	672,869	71.73	+.3	+.2	-1.2	+.7
Mass.....	55,896	4,513,151	80.74	-.2	-.3	-4.8	-3.0
Mich.....	50,513	3,689,347	73.04	+.2	+2.6	-3.8	-12.5
Minn.....	43,330	4,651,135	107.34	-.3	-3.6	-1.6	+3.9
Miss.....	76,347	2,911,827	38.14	(6/)	-.7	-2.8	+5.3
Mo.....	105,091	6,834,325	65.03	-.4	-1.3	-3.3	+3.1
Mont.....	5,726	390,158	68.14	-.5	-.5	-6.5	-2.7
Nebr.....	12,825	1,041,400	81.20	+.1	-.6	-4.4	-1.1
Nev.....	2,562	226,703	88.49	+.6	(7/)	+1.8	+6.6
N. H.....	4,614	465,196	100.82	+1.2	+2.0	-.1	+1.7
N. J.....	14,661	1,179,394	80.44	+4.4	+14.5	-20.9	-33.2
N. Mex.....	10,817	857,663	79.29	+.3	+.1	+.1	+3.7
N. Y.....	56,208	5,010,014	89.13	-.5	+2.4	-2.9	+6.5
N. C.....	44,337	2,516,537	56.76	-.1	+.2	-2.9	+7.2
N. Dak.....	5,667	470,581	83.04	-1.0	-12.5	-7.0	-7.0
Ohio.....	85,748	7,259,787	84.66	+.1	-.5	-1.5	+2.0
Okla. 4/.....	83,749	7,938,492	94.79	(6/)	-.3	-1.5	+7.0
Oreg.....	13,114	856,290	65.30	+.8	-2.6	-15.9	-35.1
Pa.....	47,832	3,567,549	74.58	-.3	-2.0	-.6	-5.3
P. R.....	33,832	314,169	9.29	-.6	-.4	-5.7	-.8
R. I.....	6,043	508,752	84.19	0	+.3	-2.5	-1.0
S. C.....	26,958	1,291,403	47.90	-.2	+2.9	-5.5	+8.4
S. Dak.....	7,587	612,060	80.67	-.3	-.1	-6.4	-4.6
Tenn.....	47,461	2,317,138	48.82	-.3	-.9	-5.4	+4.7
Tex.....	226,364	15,913,700	70.30	+.3	+.3	+2.1	+10.4
Utah.....	5,440	430,476	79.13	+.4	+16.6	-18.5	-13.1
Vt.....	5,463	461,940	84.56	+.2	+.2	-.7	+10.6
V. I.....	483	17,936	37.13	-.8	-.3	-8.5	-5.4
Va.....	13,523	807,689	59.73	-.3	-1.6	-4.1	+3.5
Wash.....	34,261	2,550,472	74.44	-.6	-20.0	-21.8	-37.7
W. Va.....	15,396	721,452	46.86	-.4	-1.0	-8.8	-8.1
Wis.....	30,340	2,862,224	94.34	+.5	-4.3	-4.2	+4.5
Wyo.....	2,603	213,040	81.84	-.1	-1.3	-4.7	-.8

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes 3,754 recipients aged 60-64 in Colorado and payments of $327,963 to these recipients. Such payments were made without Federal participation. 3/ In addition, supplemental payments of $13,826 from general assistance funds were made to 45 recipients. 4/ Represents aid to the aged under combined program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 5/ Data for July; data for August not available. 6/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 7/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 4. Medical assistance for the aged: Recipients and payments for recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

State	Number of recipients 2/	Payments for recipients		Percentage change from July 1963	
		Total amount	Average	Number	Amount
Total.....	148,467	$29,642,507	$199.66	+5.9	+4.3
Ala.....	232	59,890	258.15	+5.0	-1.3
Ark.....	2,299	133,678	58.15	+.8	-2.2
Calif.....	20,415	5,605,066	274.56	+7.9	+2.7
Conn.....	6,666	3/ 1,074,437	161.18	+40.2	+3.8
D. C.....	498	175,389	352.19	(4/)	(4/)
Fla. 5/.....	25	5,914	(6/)	(4/)	(4/)
Guam.....	112	623	5.56	---	---
Hawaii 5/.....	587	163,734	278.93	+32.5	+130.0
Idaho.....	1,654	215,566	130.33	-1.7	-6.7
Ill.....	657	287,712	437.92	-34.3	-31.8
Ky.....	5,233	146,155	27.93	+4.5	+8.1
La.....	370	57,121	154.38	-2.6	-4.9
Maine.....	356	86,256	242.29	-9.2	-19.9
Md.....	8,046	295,328	36.70	+1.1	+11.6
Mass.....	23,300	3/ 4,007,719	172.01	+.6	+4.5
Mich.....	5,089	1,772,684	348.34	-4.5	-14.2
N. H.....	205	41,602	202.94	+41.4	-8.4
N. J.....	4,238	3/ 741,637	175.00	+.2	+2.1
N. Y.....	32,606	3/ 10,141,685	311.04	+2.9	+7.8
N. Dak.....	7/ 1,040	3/ 222,070	213.53	+4.0	-3.9
Okla. 5/.....	893	147,404	165.07	+7.7	+9.1
Oreg.....	3,517	474,413	134.89	+21.7	+23.7
Pa.....	6,629	1,553,775	234.39	-5.3	-5.0
P. R.....	1,663	77,128	46.38	0	+1.4
S. C.....	458	66,776	145.80	+86.9	+136.9
Tenn.....	1,281	81,461	63.59	-17.1	-14.5
Utah.....	2,131	322,652	151.41	+18.0	+27.9
Vt.....	63	20,990	333.17	(6/)	(6/)
V. I.....	105	3,409	32.47	-30.0	0
Wash.....	9,122	1,289,647	141.38	-11.0	-6.9
W. Va.....	8,977	370,586	41.28	+79.0	+236.5
Wyo.....	(8/)	(8/)	---	---	---

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Persons for whom vendor payments were made during the report month. 3/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $564 in Connecticut, $97,720 in Massachusetts, $11,382 in New Jersey, $47,326 in New York, and $2,242 in North Dakota. 4/ No payment made in July 1963. 5/ Represents medical assistance for the aged under combined program for aid to the aged, blind or disabled and medical assistance for the aged. 6/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 7/ Includes an unknown number of cases receiving only money payments. 8/ No payments made.

Table 5. Aid to the blind: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	July 1963 in--		August 1962 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total 2/....	98,141	$8,009,148	$81.61	+0.1	-0.4	-1.9	+2.0
Ala.....	1,702	81,118	47.66	-.3	-1.2	+3.3	+11.8
Alaska.....	105	7,954	75.75	+1.9	+.4	(3/)	(3/)
Ariz.....	850	62,215	73.19	-.6	-.1	-3.4	-2.5
Ark.....	1,980	139,065	70.23	+.4	+3.5	+.2	+12.9
Calif. 2/.....	12,231	1,563,839	127.86	(4/)	-.6	-3.8	-1.0
Colo.....	253	20,510	81.07	-1.9	-3.0	+2.8	+.3
Conn.....	308	33,551	108.93	+1.3	-10.5	+2.0	-8.5
Del.....	286	21,325	74.56	+1.4	+1.2	+8.3	+4.0
D. C.....	184	13,347	72.54	+1.1	+1.0	-7.1	-7.0
Fla. 5/.....	2,602	171,310	65.84	+1.2	+2.1	+3.0	+6.9
Ga.....	3,115	182,374	58.55	+.3	+1.5	-.2	+10.9
Guam 6/.....	7	154	(3/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 5/.....	85	9,596	112.89	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)
Idaho.....	130	9,177	70.59	-.8	+1.2	-4.4	-6.7
Ill.....	2,750	258,416	93.97	-.2	-.2	-4.9	-1.8
Ind.....	1,810	143,011	79.01	+1.3	-8.4	-2.6	-.4
Iowa.....	1,258	125,654	99.88	-.5	-1.8	-6.4	-5.9
Kans.....	539	49,247	91.37	0	-2.5	-2.9	+4.2
Ky.....	2,390	168,484	70.50	+.2	+1.5	+.3	+17.1
La.....	2,826	229,764	81.30	+.4	-.1	+2.5	+2.1
Maine.....	410	33,726	82.26	+.2	+.2	+1.0	+13.9
Md.....	401	30,792	76.79	-2.0	-1.9	-5.2	+9.4
Mass.....	2,258	285,037	126.23	-.3	-9.6	-.2	-3.3
Mich.....	1,679	130,309	77.61	+.7	+4.0	-1.7	-6.1
Minn.....	1,120	116,385	103.92	+8.1	+1.4	+7.6	+1.9
Miss.....	3,102	134,157	43.25	-.7	-.1	-8.3	+3.5
Mo. 2/.....	4,641	324,870	70.00	-.2	-.2	-3.8	+3.6
Mont.....	274	21,016	76.70	+.4	+.7	-7.7	-4.5
Nebr.....	667	64,064	96.05	-.1	-3.2	-4.6	-1.9
Nev.....	169	20,049	118.63	+1.2	-3.5	-1.7	+16.0
N. H.....	262	27,416	104.64	+.8	-1.2	+4.0	+6.6
N. J.....	941	73,561	78.17	+.4	+4.4	-.4	-13.1
N. Mex.....	344	32,007	93.04	-2.0	-1.6	-2.5	-31.0
N. Y.....	3,202	350,024	109.31	-.4	+5.4	-4.2	+10.7
N. C.....	5,145	321,725	62.53	+.2	-1.7	+1.3	+9.5
N. Dak.....	81	7,606	93.90	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)
Ohio.....	3,425	285,033	83.22	-.3	-2.0	+.2	+4.4
Okla. 5/.....	1,718	206,110	119.97	+.4	+1.0	-1.3	+10.4
Oreg.....	389	33,346	85.72	+1.0	+2.0	+14.4	+1.5
Pa. 2/.....	17,833	1,341,054	75.20	+.2	+.8	-.5	-1.7
P. R.....	1,535	13,246	8.63	-3.8	(4/)	-8.1	-3.7
R. I.....	102	8,586	84.18	-2.9	-.6	-10.5	-9.1
S. C.....	1,702	100,921	59.30	+.4	+1.9	+1.1	+21.7
S. Dak.....	137	8,950	65.33	+1.5	+1.5	-7.4	-8.1
Tenn.....	2,352	121,364	51.60	-.6	(7/)	-5.0	+4.9
Tex.....	4,991	344,023	68.93	-.8	-.8	-4.5	+5.5
Utah.....	181	15,467	85.45	+3.4	+16.8	+3.4	+14.4
Vt.....	111	7,382	66.50	0	+.2	+1.8	+6.9
V. I.....	15	496	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)
Va.....	1,147	74,669	65.10	+.4	-4.5	-2.0	+3.3
Wash.....	652	55,475	85.08	-1.1	-22.7	-3.4	-19.9
W. Va.....	863	40,826	47.31	-.5	-1.0	-7.0	-5.7
Wis.....	829	85,077	102.63	-.6	+8.8	-6.0	+3.5
Wyo.....	52	4,268	82.08	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Data include recipients of payments made without Federal participation and payments to these recipients as follows: California, $27,429 to 173 recipients; Missouri, $53,175 to 747 recipients; and Pennsylvania, $925,349 to 12,421 recipients. 3/ Average payments not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change, on fewer than 100 recipients. 4/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 5/ Represents aid to the blind under combined program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 6/ Data for July; data for August not available. 7/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 6. Aid to the permanently and totally disabled: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of recipients	Payments to recipients		Percentage change from--			
		Total amount	Average	July 1963 in--		August 1962 in--	
				Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total	470,155	$35,424,029	$75.35	+0.8	+0.9	+11.8	+16.9
Ala.	13,778	624,957	45.36	+.5	-.2	+7.5	+17.6
Alaska	25	1,918	(2/)	(2/)	(2/)	(3/)	(3/)
Ariz.	2,035	138,965	68.29	+7.5	+7.4	+542.0	+545.2
Ark.	8,927	506,249	56.71	+1.9	+2.1	+13.4	+33.4
Calif.	36,204	3,975,075	109.80	+3.9	+1.9	+51.9	+63.5
Colo.	5,831	423,252	72.59	+.3	+.3	+3.7	+3.6
Conn.	6,729	469,276	69.74	+2.4	-11.7	+181.1	+41.1
Del.	430	30,912	71.89	-.2	-.5	-4.9	+7.1
D. C.	2,953	229,030	77.56	+.3	+.9	-4.3	-.9
Fla. 4/	15,176	1,040,721	68.58	+2.5	+5.5	+14.3	+20.6
Ga.	25,528	1,477,725	57.89	+.1	-.9	+3.8	+15.9
Guam 5/	79	1,950	24.68	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 4/	1,119	154,704	138.25	+12.6	+59.4	+9.2	+41.8
Idaho	2,455	134,446	54.76	+.7	-.9	+16.7	+2.7
Ill.	27,757	2,709,359	97.61	-.5	-.3	+2.0	+1.6
Ind.	421	57,710	137.08	+26.0	+63.5	(6/)	(6/)
Iowa	985	80,955	82.19	+2.9	+3.6	+20.0	+45.1
Kans.	4,335	443,818	102.38	-.2	+3.4	+3.1	+15.8
Ky.	9,301	674,931	72.57	+.3	+.8	+7.4	+23.5
La.	18,290	1,046,395	57.21	+.2	+.2	+3.2	+3.8
Maine	2,387	206,037	86.32	+.6	+1.1	+5.9	+19.5
Md.	6,780	522,681	77.09	+1.1	+1.1	+5.0	+18.5
Mass.	10,716	1,408,754	131.46	+.6	+.8	+2.4	+4.1
Mich.	6,836	727,908	106.48	+1.5	+12.0	+12.1	+18.5
Minn.	3,435	191,289	55.69	+9.7	+.6	+19.1	+8.9
Miss.	15,853	637,169	40.19	+1.8	+1.6	+17.3	+37.1
Mo.	14,710	990,257	67.32	-.2	-.8	-1.7	+4.2
Mont.	1,261	95,034	75.36	+.7	+.5	+1.0	+3.2
Nebr.	2,250	182,100	80.93	+2.3	+1.4	+3.9	+6.0
N. H.	528	60,210	114.03	+1.7	+2.9	+6.9	+6.4
N. J.	7,958	753,384	94.67	+2.1	+15.1	+5.8	+6.2
N. Mex.	3,278	296,316	90.40	+1.0	+1.2	+11.7	+34.5
N. Y.	34,960	4,299,466	122.98	-.8	+3.2	+1.7	+12.4
N. C.	21,829	1,457,084	66.75	+.3	+.7	+3.2	+12.8
N. Dak.	1,270	124,984	98.41	-.3	-18.3	+.2	-2.6
Ohio	17,907	1,442,933	80.58	+.3	+.4	+13.3	+20.2
Okla 4/	11,958	1,300,077	108.72	+.5	+.6	+8.8	+19.4
Oreg.	7,546	471,480	62.48	+1.1	+1.0	+56.7	+6.9
Pa.	19,425	1,243,286	64.00	+.3	+.1	+4.7	+.6
P. R.	21,673	186,195	8.59	-.3	-1.2	-2.8	-3.4
R. I.	2,629	237,607	90.38	+2.1	+1.9	-2.6	+1.8
S. C.	8,351	426,354	51.05	+.4	+3.7	+3.0	+15.1
S. Dak.	1,100	74,226	67.48	+1.1	+1.5	+1.2	+5.4
Tenn.	12,223	610,821	49.97	+.6	+1.1	+5.2	+15.4
Tex.	8,637	496,132	57.44	+1.2	+1.2	+9.6	+16.7
Utah	4,691	372,753	79.46	+1.3	+14.0	+28.5	+31.7
Vt.	954	66,334	69.53	+.2	+1.6	+7.4	+18.4
V. I.	92	3,016	32.78	(2/)	(2/)	(2/)	(2/)
Va.	6,473	418,195	64.61	(7/)	-3.4	-.2	+4.6
Wash.	17,463	930,445	53.28	+.4	-22.1	+96.2	+11.0
W. Va.	6,621	325,362	49.14	-1.5	-1.5	-9.4	-4.5
Wis.	5,425	596,784	110.01	+.1	+2.8	+12.6	+21.4
Wyo.	578	47,008	81.33	-.9	-2.6	+1.8	+7.1

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients. 3/ Program initiated July 1963. 4/ Represents aid to the permanently and totally disabled under combined program for aid to the aged, blind or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 5/ Data for July; data for August not available. 6/ Program initiated February 1963. 7/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

Table 7. Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
					Average per--		July 1963 in--		August 1962 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total amount	Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 3/ 4/.	955,014	3,912,364	2,933,517	$121,197,927	$126.91	$30.98	-0.2	+0.5	+7.6	+5.4
Ala. 4/.....	22,496	91,422	71,969	1,063,241	47.26	11.63	+.2	+.2	+3.2	+7.6
Alaska.....	1,233	4,444	3,373	152,749	123.88	34.37	+.6	+.6	+3.4	+2.9
Ariz. 3/ 4/....	9,809	41,752	31,335	1,212,510	123.61	29.04	+1.9	+1.4	+10.6	+7.9
Ark.....	6,755	26,509	20,496	455,826	67.48	17.20	-1.0	-.1	+12.8	+20.9
Calif. 4/.....	92,949	357,945	270,959	15,667,786	168.56	43.77	(5/)	-.2	+9.2	+6.5
Colo.....	9,914	38,933	30,173	1,426,066	143.84	36.63	+.8	+1.3	+13.3	+20.7
Conn. 3/.....	12,408	48,852	35,348	2,167,874	174.72	44.38	-6.8	(6/)	+18.9	+6.3
Del. 3/.....	2,025	8,949	6,776	198,162	97.86	22.14	+3.2	+3.2	+28.0	+29.4
D. C.....	3,949	18,563	14,797	603,577	152.84	32.52	-2.8	-2.3	-15.3	-16.1
Fla.....	27,765	104,400	83,696	1,714,345	61.74	16.42	-.1	(6/)	+4.5	+3.5
Ga.....	15,819	59,096	46,018	1,376,896	87.04	23.30	-.9	-.9	-4.4	-3.9
Guam 7/.....	171	878	729	11,370	66.49	12.95	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 3/.....	3,139	13,360	10,038	538,596	171.58	40.31	+.8	+20.6	+9.5	+9.4
Idaho.....	2,472	9,613	7,001	394,014	159.39	40.99	-.1	(5/)	+3.6	+2.9
Ill. 3/ 4/.....	55,607	259,239	197,649	10,976,624	197.40	42.34	-.3	+.8	+.5	-7.3
Ind. 4/.....	12,045	47,808	35,442	1,332,412	110.62	27.87	-.5	+.6	+2.3	+.7
Iowa.....	10,892	42,919	30,996	1,562,272	143.43	36.40	-.4	-.8	+12.7	+6.5
Kans. 3/.....	7,133	28,839	22,306	1,079,003	151.27	37.41	+1.9	+2.9	+12.8	+12.3
Ky.....	20,502	77,458	55,998	1,924,422	93.87	24.84	-1.0	-.2	-1.5	-2.8
La. 4/.....	22,601	97,937	73,915	2,241,652	99.18	22.89	+.3	+.7	+8.8	+3.4
Maine.....	5,928	21,467	15,982	638,064	107.64	29.72	-1.4	-1.4	+.1	+1.6
Md. 3/ 4/.....	13,979	60,345	46,490	1,944,191	139.08	32.22	+.8	+1.4	+17.6	+21.2
Mass. 3/.....	21,026	77,456	58,478	3,429,596	163.11	44.28	(6/)	+.9	+17.5	+17.0
Mich.....	33,837	128,226	92,052	4,493,306	132.79	35.04	-.2	-.4	+7.4	-5.4
Minn.....	11,882	42,738	33,462	2,060,850	173.44	48.22	-.1	-1.0	+7.3	+11.2
Miss.....	20,395	81,160	64,220	720,012	35.30	8.87	+.3	(5/)	+1.9	-.8
Mo.....	25,716	104,445	78,359	2,472,233	96.14	23.67	+1.9	-.8	+.2	-2.3
Mont.....	1,726	6,912	5,336	233,351	135.20	33.76	-1.2	-1.2	-3.9	-4.9
Nebr.....	3,336	13,672	10,526	402,328	120.60	29.43	+1.0	+.1	+7.8	+5.7
Nev.....	1,316	4,921	3,919	157,151	119.42	31.93	+.5	+1.3	+9.2	+19.1
N. H.....	978	3,969	2,935	172,555	176.44	43.48	-1.1	+.2	+2.0	+8.2
N. J.....	23,250	90,360	68,377	4,273,837	183.82	47.30	+2.5	+8.4	+16.0	+15.9
N. Mex. 4/.....	7,581	30,882	23,370	1,045,337	137.89	33.85	+.5	+.6	+4.8	+13.0
N. Y. 3/.....	100,581	438,139	321,208	18,414,913	183.09	42.03	+.5	+2.4	+22.1	+17.3
N. C. 4/.....	26,593	109,622	81,459	2,551,533	95.95	23.28	-1.4	-1.8	+3.8	+9.3
N. Dak.....	1,636	6,482	4,963	245,801	150.25	37.92	-5.1	-16.7	-3.0	-8.8
Ohio.....	37,274	152,469	114,437	4,535,512	121.68	29.75	-.1	(6/)	+7.9	+12.1
Okla. 3/ 4/.....	18,474	71,530	52,730	2,525,005	136.68	35.30	+.9	+2.2	+2.1	+6.9
Oreg. 3/ 4/.....	7,391	27,121	20,443	1,035,180	140.06	38.17	-7.8	-9.0	+6.3	+7.8
Pa. 3/.....	75,168	334,682	235,539	9,157,819	121.83	27.36	-.7	-1.1	+19.2	-1.3
P. R.....	53,744	214,885	171,711	786,467	14.63	3.66	-.6	-1.7	-4.6	-6.4
R. I. 3/.....	5,342	21,496	15,769	854,448	159.95	39.75	+.5	+.9	+13.7	+11.6
S. C.....	8,060	32,306	25,845	508,336	63.07	15.74	-1.4	-.4	-6.2	+2.4
S. Dak.....	2,895	10,304	7,854	362,674	125.28	35.20	+.5	+.8	+2.7	+21.9
Tenn.....	20,396	79,717	59,632	1,473,611	72.25	18.49	-.6	-.8	-4.3	-4.3
Tex.....	18,536	81,680	62,627	1,494,914	80.65	18.30	+1.8	+.6	+1.4	-2.5
Utah 3/ 4/.....	4,469	18,355	13,414	714,015	159.77	38.90	-2.8	+11.4	+20.1	+39.6
Vt.....	1,283	4,682	3,525	142,909	111.39	30.52	-2.5	-1.8	-1.3	-.1
V. I.....	296	1,069	906	17,783	60.08	16.64	+2.6	+2.3	-1.1	+2.2
Va. 4/.....	10,327	43,621	33,484	1,032,609	99.99	23.67	-.4	-.1	+2.3	+.9
Wash. 3/ 4/....	12,352	47,244	34,627	1,834,766	148.54	38.84	+4.4	-5.1	+14.0	+5.5
W. Va. 3/ 4/...	27,568	125,799	86,515	3,354,680	121.69	26.67	-1.6	-2.2	+4.5	-1.9
Wis. 4/.....	11,185	42,535	31,873	1,894,714	169.40	44.54	-.6	-1.3	+3.8	+2.8
Wyo.....	810	3,157	2,436	118,030	145.72	37.39	+.3	+2.3	+9.4	+10.8

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ Includes data on unemployed-parent segment; see table 8. 4/ Includes data on foster-family care; see table 9. 5/ Increase of less than 0.05 percent. 6/ Decrease of less than 0.05 percent. 7/ Data for July; data for August not available.

Table 8. Aid to families with dependent children, unemployed-parent segment: Recipients and payments to recipients, August 1963 1/

/Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from July 1963 in--	
		Total 2/	Children	Total	Average per--			
					Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount
Total...	50,568	285,196	188,304	$8,222,180	$162.60	$28.83	-3.8	-1.1
Ariz.....	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	---	---	---	---
Conn.....	2,020	10,798	7,013	318,114	157.48	29.46	-28.5	-14.2
Del.....	239	1,376	929	31,514	131.86	22.90	-.3	+4.9
Hawaii.....	337	2,074	1,430	64,357	190.97	31.03	-2.2	+9.3
Ill.....	7,931	50,406	34,872	1,969,378	248.31	39.07	-2.1	+1.4
Kans.....	34	165	107	5,477	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)	(4/)
Md.....	408	2,487	1,692	70,425	172.61	28.32	-4.2	-6.8
Mass.....	426	2,297	1,514	96,226	225.88	41.89	+1.6	+.3
N. Y.....	12,878	74,133	49,797	2,214,083	171.93	29.87	-1.3	+.1
Okla.....	28	160	107	4,585	(4/)	(4/)	-5.3	-.5
Oreg.....	235	1,055	794	38,881	165.45	36.85	-64.2	-64.2
Pa.....	12,618	67,939	43,498	1,424,953	112.93	20.97	-4.6	-3.4
R. I.....	508	2,857	1,881	97,922	192.76	34.27	-1.4	-.8
Utah.....	794	4,349	2,960	105,975	133.47	24.37	+.3	+6.6
Wash.....	740	3,985	2,518	114,010	154.07	28.61	+92.0	+332.7
W. Va.....	11,372	61,115	39,192	1,666,280	146.52	27.26	-2.4	-2.6

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in table 7. All data subject to revision. 2/ Includes as recipients the children and 1 or both parents or 1 caretaker relative other than a parent in families in which the requirements of such adults were considered in determining the amount of assistance. 3/ No payments made in August. 4/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 families; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients.

Table 9. Aid to families with dependent children receiving foster care: Recipients and

50 families; percentage change on fewer than 100 recipients.

Table 9. Aid to families with dependent children receiving foster care: Recipients and payments for foster care, by State, August 1963 1/

State	Number of--				Payments for foster care			
	Children receiving foster care			Families from which children were removed	Total amount	Average per child	In foster homes	In institutions
	Total	In foster homes	In institutions					
Total.....	3,499	2/ 2,736	2/ 113	1,445	$252,358	$72.12	2/ $170,802	2/ $19,022
Ala.....	15	15	0	6	538	(3/)	538	0
Ariz.....	147	147	0	56	6,781	46.13	6,781	0
Calif.....	997	913	84	447	87,587	87.85	70,956	16,631
Ill.....	650	(2/)	(2/)	268	62,534	96.21	(2/)	(2/)
Ind.....	68	68	0	24	2,583	37.99	2,583	0
La.....	334	322	12	134	18,355	54.96	17,358	997
Md.....	234	225	9	88	16,213	69.29	15,517	696
Minn.....	20	19	1	12	1,303	(3/)	1,109	194
N. Mex.....	73	73	0	25	4,097	56.12	4,097	0
N. C.....	34	34	0	9	1,674	(3/)	1,674	0
Okla.....	216	216	0	92	8,906	41.23	8,906	0
Oreg.....	217	217	0	82	13,891	64.01	13,891	0
Utah.....	175	175	0	73	8,490	48.51	8,490	0
Va.....	59	59	0	16	2,324	39.39	2,324	0
Wash.....	38	38	0	20	2,050	(3/)	2,050	0
W. Va.....	43	36	7	20	3,186	(3/)	2,682	504
Wis.....	179	179	0	73	11,846	66.18	11,846	0

1/ Data for this segment of the program, shown separately here, are included in Table 7. All data subject to revision. 2/ Excludes Illinois; breakdown not available. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 children.

Table 10. General assistance: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, August 1963 1/

/Excludes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments/

State	Number of--		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from--			
				Average per--		July 1963 in--		August 1962 in--	
	Cases	Recipients	Total amount	Case	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total 2/.....	326,000	767,000	$21,370,000	$65.63	$27.87	-0.3	-0.2	-3.7	-4.7
Ala.....	92	92	1,174	12.76	12.76	-12.4	-12.5	-16.4	-20.2
Alaska.....	218	649	13,944	63.96	21.49	+2.9	+15.3	+65.6	+34.8
Ariz.....	2,238	4,846	129,866	58.03	26.80	+6.6	-1.7	-29.9	-38.9
Ark.....	355	1,385	5,267	14.84	3.80	+18.6	+6.9	+22.5	+6.0
Calif.....	30,338	67,868	1,935,129	63.79	28.51	-.2	-.1	+5.4	+3.2
Colo.....	1,329	4,560	54,744	41.19	12.01	+.5	+3.0	-7.1	-8.2
Conn.....	3/ 4,274	3/ 10,460	3/ 278,852	65.24	26.66	-4.7	-.3	-4.0	-12.3
Del.....	1,250	2,314	66,765	53.41	28.85	+2.1	+.6	-30.7	-25.4
D. C.....	566	612	41,832	73.91	68.35	-15.1	-15.6	-44.8	-45.5
Fla. 4/.....	8,600	(5/)	259,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Ga.....	2,373	5,324	75,398	31.77	14.16	+1.3	+3.2	-4.0	+3.9
Guam 6/.....	5	5	138	(7/)	(7/)	---	---	---	---
Hawaii.....	1,071	1,355	70,030	65.39	51.68	-3.1	+1.4	-3.1	+1.3
Ill.....	26,983	56,345	2,147,665	79.59	38.12	+1.5	+.3	-12.9	-20.1
Iowa 4/.....	3,700	8,300	143,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Kans.....	3,067	8,383	205,824	67.11	24.55	-1.1	+2.7	+7.8	+11.2
Ky.....	1,684	4,890	63,549	37.74	13.00	-7.3	-8.0	-9.2	-6.6
La.....	7,817	8,577	406,808	52.04	47.43	+1.2	+1.2	+5.7	+5.1
Maine.....	2,016	6,605	90,446	44.86	13.69	-2.6	+4.5	-6.8	+.1
Md.....	5,077	5,672	364,293	71.75	64.23	+.7	+1.8	+13.2	+17.4
Mass.....	7,327	15,265	485,227	66.22	31.79	+3.6	-4.0	+10.4	+6.1
Mich.....	28,130	98,050	2,842,698	101.06	28.99	-3.4	-1.2	-17.6	-22.1
Minn.....	8,718	24,300	692,143	79.39	28.48	+.3	+.2	+11.1	+11.1
Miss.....	1,040	1,482	15,210	14.62	10.26	+.1	-1.3	+7.5	+2.2
Mo.....	9,202	12,109	605,453	65.80	50.00	+.8	+.2	-.1	+16.1
Mont.....	1,134	3,421	52,374	46.19	15.31	+8.5	+10.6	+15.0	+13.8
Nebr.....	870	2,608	51,768	59.50	19.85	-.9	+17.7	+3.4	+9.4
Nev.....	302	609	17,564	58.16	28.84	+11.1	+.9	+79.1	+72.1
N. H.....	821	2,646	45,869	55.87	17.34	-6.8	-4.9	+21.0	+19.0
N. J. 8/.....	9,017	29,887	1,115,838	123.75	37.34	+2.4	+2.5	+21.5	+13.8
N. Mex.....	444	814	18,581	41.85	22.83	+7.8	+5.2	+23.5	+18.0
N. Y. 9/.....	34,917	79,404	2,717,066	77.81	34.22	+.2	+.4	+11.3	+20.3
N. C.....	1,506	4,199	41,760	27.73	9.95	+5.4	+10.6	+12.6	+15.9
N. Dak.....	301	1,038	14,744	48.98	14.20	-17.6	-22.2	-7.7	-9.2
Ohio.....	30,175	105,821	2,152,118	71.32	20.34	+.2	+1.9	-16.2	-22.1
Okla.....	7,744	(5/)	94,441	12.20	---	---	+16.2	---	+7.9
Oreg.....	4,291	(5/)	204,646	47.69	---	---	-19.2	---	+4.3
Pa.....	37,716	45,560	2,232,024	59.18	48.99	-1.8	-.2	+.4	+1.3
P. R.....	1,126	1,126	8,852	7.86	7.86	+213.6	+224.7	-31.8	-29.7
R. I.....	2,695	5,939	164,724	61.12	27.74	+3.1	+22.2	+5.2	+21.4
S. C.....	1,331	1,544	39,494	29.67	25.58	-5.5	-13.2	-35.9	-14.9
S. Dak.....	299	962	10,402	34.79	10.81	+1.9	+17.0	+9.4	+25.8
Tenn.....	1,616	4,763	34,513	21.36	7.25	+2.6	+9.4	-24.1	-9.1
Tex. 6/ 10/.....	11,800	(5/)	232,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Utah.....	1,428	3,755	90,938	63.68	24.22	-7.6	-13.4	+31.2	+13.2
Vt. 10/.....	1,000	(5/)	23,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
V. I.....	168	174	5,399	32.14	31.03	+4.8	+3.0	+8.1	+10.2
Va.....	2,326	5,589	109,270	46.98	19.55	+9.2	+7.5	+13.3	+4.9
Wash.....	7,271	15,694	516,036	70.97	32.88	-14.6	-12.0	+4.3	+.1
W. Va.....	1,245	2,068	54,005	43.38	26.11	+1.0	+22.8	+.6	+34.7
Wis.....	7,316	22,366	614,714	84.02	27.48	-3.3	-3.3	+1.5	-4.4
Wyo.....	263	922	17,327	65.88	18.79	-5.0	-4.1	-28.0	-33.3

1/ All data subject to revision. 2/ Partly estimated; does not represent sum of State figures because totals exclude for New Jersey an estimated number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial and payments for such services; recipient count also includes an estimate for States not reporting such data. Excludes Idaho and Indiana; data not available. 3/ About 9 percent of this total is estimated. 4/ Partly estimated. 5/ Data not available. 6/ Data for July; data for August not available. 7/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients. 8/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care, hospitalization, and/or burial, and total payments for such services. 9/ Includes an unknown number of cases and persons receiving only medical care. 10/ Estimated on basis of reports from sample of local jurisdictions.

Table II. Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, August 1963 1/

State	Old-age assistance	Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	Aid to families with dependent children	General assistance
Total.....	$32,749,431	$29,642,507	$870,568	$8,445,587	$9,605,413	2/ $8,493,000
Ala.....	847,831	59,890	2,572	51,832	359	6
Alaska.....	21,271	---	---	---	---	3/ 67,680
Ariz.....	27,363	---	---	---	---	---
Ark.....	760,679	133,678	23,125	169,904	41,935	42,368
Calif.....	3,513,236	5,605,066	168,826	743,205	791,405	104,474
Colo.....	1,109,518	---	3,291	82,193	107,221	97,672
Conn.....	223,519	4/ 1,074,437	15,049	242,998	337,307	(5/)
Del.....	11,968	---	1,119	---	---	---
D. C.....	63,422	175,389	276	11,470	898	190
Fla. 6/.....	1,133,050	5,914	19,065	221,172	56,382	---
Ga.....	585,328	---	8,454	92,784	---	---
Guam 7/.....	95	623	---	---	---	---
Hawaii 6/.....	21,695	163,734	3,698	82,032	101,050	37,848
Idaho.....	51,492	215,566	207	21,428	---	---
Ill.....	2,485,092	287,712	77,364	816,089	1,371,829	3/ 684,219
Ind.....	764,809	---	34,645	37,519	208,174	---
Iowa.....	950,340	---	11,868	---	142,944	3/ 8/ 261,000
Kans.....	444,309	---	8,746	78,285	132,265	85,813
Ky.....	489,937	146,155	15,529	92,029	163,578	---
La.....	1,361,776	57,121	5,289	77,229	12,522	4,953
Maine.....	295,714	86,256	4,510	40,562	41,496	81,403
Md.....	86,649	295,328	3,665	63,867	---	2,526
Mass.....	1,045,680	4/ 4,007,719	11,008	739,593	403,455	170,381
Mich.....	151,143	1,772,684	5,455	170,935	29,845	7/ 390,345
Minn.....	2,762,209	---	49,975	41,946	280,420	401,171
Miss.....	87,229	---	---	---	---	---
Mo.....	649,526	---	---	15,538	23,055	10,413
Mont.....	807	---	---	---	81	3/ 316,795
Nebr.....	437,806	---	23,058	66,561	11,557	3/ 96,026
Nev.....	53,620	---	3,749	(9/)	9,878	3/ 170,936
N. H.....	104,733	41,602	5,422	19,186	29,156	(5/)
N. J.....	316,666	4/ 741,637	4,457	217,606	212,802	303,791
N. Mex.....	218,728	---	7,201	68,818	123,580	5,675
N. Y.....	1,156,933	4/ 10,141,685	93,833	1,895,532	2,438,111	266,989
N. C.....	325,900	---	17,759	236,988	175,458	3/ 119,465
N. Dak.....	129,195	4/ 222,070	2,278	49,486	17,164	3/ 13,940
Ohio.....	1,580,558	---	43,315	258,481	344,330	3/ 1,316,305
Okla. 6/.....	1,507,158	147,404	30,996	215,550	178,298	(5/)
Oreg.....	138,188	474,413	2,806	128,216	86,077	72,053
Pa.....	585,259	1,553,775	74,745	228,920	446,093	156,254
P. R.....	28,911	77,128	---	---	---	---
R. I.....	93,666	---	1,530	46,271	126,838	3/ 58,222
S. C.....	193,017	66,776	7,734	48,600	14,722	2,545
S. Dak.....	94,838	---	---	---	---	3/ 95,255
Tenn.....	291,901	81,461	3,058	22,001	34,673	---
Tex.....	2,639,323	---	---	---	---	---
Utah.....	123,992	322,652	4,758	184,344	164,487	3,116
Vt.....	192,181	20,990	619	9,473	---	---
V. I.....	2,898	3,409	4	92	15	195
Va.....	207,476	---	10,318	67,074	38,174	3/ 15,456
Wash.....	359,608	1,289,647	9,594	343,700	206,825	67,258
W. Va.....	136,701	370,586	5,148	59,004	449,799	9,207
Wis.....	1,851,190	---	43,928	380,075	242,411	355,056
Wyo.....	33,098	(10/)	522	6,939	8,744	39,519

1/ For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported. 2/ Includes an estimated amount for States making vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds and reporting these data semiannually but not on a monthly basis. 3/ Includes payments made in behalf of recipients of the special types of public assistance. 4/ Includes money payments not subject to Federal participation as follows: $564 in Connecticut, $97,720 in Massachusetts, $11,382 in New Jersey, $47,326 in New York, and $2,242 in North Dakota. 5/ Data not available. 6/ Except for aid to families with dependent children and general assistance, data represent payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under combined program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 7/ Data for July; data for August not available. 8/ Partly estimated. 9/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled. 10/ No payments made in August.

Table 12. Average payment per recipient for all assistance, for money payments, and for vendor payments for medical care, by program and State, August 1963 1/

State	Old-age assistance			Medical assistance for the aged	Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled			Aid to families with dependent children (per recipient)		
	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care		All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care	All assistance	Money payments to recipients	Vendor payments for medical care
All States.....	$76.16	$61.23	$14.92	$199.66	$81.61	$72.74	$8.87	$75.35	$57.38	$17.96	$30.98	$28.52	$2.46
Ala.....	67.42	59.51	7.91	258.15	47.66	46.15	1.51	45.36	41.60	3.76	11.63	11.63	(2/)
Alaska.....	81.33	66.53	14.79	---	75.75	75.75	---	(3/)	(3/)	---	34.37	34.37	---
Ariz.....	62.13	60.08	2.05	---	73.19	73.19	---	68.29	68.29	---	29.04	29.04	---
Ark.....	64.13	50.89	13.24	58.15	70.23	58.56	11.68	56.71	37.68	19.03	17.20	15.61	1.58
Calif.....	107.45	94.22	13.22	274.56	127.86	114.06	13.80	109.80	89.27	20.53	43.77	41.56	2.21
Colo.....	104.65	82.18	22.47	---	81.07	68.06	13.01	72.59	58.49	14.10	36.63	33.87	2.75
Conn.....	84.23	58.16	26.07	161.18	108.93	60.07	48.86	69.74	33.63	36.11	44.38	37.47	6.90
Del.....	63.35	52.42	10.93	---	74.56	70.65	3.91	71.89	71.89	---	22.14	22.14	---
D. C.....	87.01	62.17	24.83	352.19	72.54	71.04	1.50	77.56	73.67	3.88	32.52	32.47	.05
Fla. 4/.....	63.56	47.58	15.98	(5/)	65.84	58.51	7.33	68.58	54.00	14.57	16.42	15.88	.54
Ga.....	54.58	48.23	6.35	---	58.55	55.83	2.71	57.89	54.25	3.63	23.30	23.30	---
Guam 6/.....	26.64	---	---	5.56	(3/)	(3/)	---	24.68	24.68	---	12.95	12.95	---
Hawaii 4/.....	71.00	52.18	18.82	278.93	112.89	69.39	43.51	138.25	64.94	73.31	40.31	32.75	7.56
Idaho.....	71.76	61.72	10.04	130.33	70.59	69.00	1.59	54.76	46.04	8.73	40.99	40.99	---
Ill.....	86.08	45.72	40.35	437.92	93.97	65.84	28.13	97.61	68.21	29.40	42.34	37.05	5.29
Ind.....	75.44	43.35	32.09	---	79.01	59.87	19.14	137.08	47.96	89.12	27.87	23.52	4.35
Iowa.....	89.25	57.35	31.90	---	99.88	90.45	9.43	82.19	82.19	---	36.40	33.07	3.33
Kans.....	91.02	72.79	18.23	---	91.37	75.14	16.23	102.38	84.32	18.06	37.41	32.83	4.59
Ky.....	60.86	51.90	8.96	27.93	70.50	64.00	6.50	72.57	62.67	9.89	24.84	22.73	2.11
La.....	79.86	69.26	10.59	154.38	81.30	79.43	1.87	57.21	52.99	4.22	22.89	22.76	.13
Maine.....	79.89	53.40	26.49	242.29	82.26	71.26	11.00	86.32	69.32	16.99	29.72	27.79	1.93
Md.....	71.73	62.50	9.24	36.70	76.79	67.65	9.14	77.09	67.67	9.42	32.22	32.22	---
Mass.....	80.74	62.03	18.71	172.01	126.23	121.36	4.88	131.46	62.45	69.02	44.28	39.07	5.21
Mich.....	73.04	70.05	2.99	348.34	77.61	74.36	3.25	106.48	81.47	25.01	35.04	34.81	.23
Minn.....	107.34	43.59	63.75	---	103.92	59.29	44.62	55.69	43.48	12.21	48.22	41.66	6.56
Miss.....	38.14	37.00	1.14	---	43.25	43.25	---	40.19	40.19	---	8.87	8.87	---
Mo.....	65.03	58.85	6.18	---	70.00	70.00	---	67.32	66.26	1.06	23.67	23.45	.22
Mont.....	68.14	68.00	.14	---	76.70	76.70	---	75.36	75.36	---	33.76	33.75	.01
Nebr.....	81.20	47.06	34.14	---	96.05	61.48	34.57	80.93	51.35	29.58	29.43	28.58	.85
Nev.....	88.49	67.56	20.93	---	118.63	96.45	22.18	(7/)	(7/)	(7/)	31.93	29.93	2.01
N. H.....	100.82	78.08	22.74	202.94	104.64	83.95	20.69	114.03	77.70	36.34	43.48	36.13	7.35
N. J.....	80.44	58.85	21.60	175.00	78.17	73.44	4.74	94.67	67.33	27.34	47.30	44.94	2.36
N. Mex.....	79.29	59.07	20.22	---	93.04	72.11	20.93	90.40	69.40	20.99	33.85	29.85	4.00
N. Y.....	89.13	68.55	20.58	311.04	109.31	80.01	29.30	122.98	68.76	54.22	42.03	36.47	5.56
N. C.....	56.76	49.41	7.35	---	62.53	59.08	3.45	66.75	55.89	10.86	23.28	21.68	1.60
N. Dak.....	83.04	60.24	22.80	213.53	93.90	65.78	28.12	98.41	59.45	38.97	37.92	35.27	2.65
Ohio.....	84.66	66.23	18.43	---	83.22	70.57	12.65	80.58	66.14	14.43	29.75	27.49	2.26
Okla. 4/.....	94.79	76.79	18.00	165.07	119.97	101.93	18.04	108.72	90.69	18.03	35.30	32.81	2.49
Oreg.....	65.30	54.76	10.54	134.89	85.72	78.51	7.21	62.48	45.49	16.99	38.17	35.00	3.17
Pa.....	74.58	62.35	12.24	234.39	75.20	71.01	4.19	64.00	52.22	11.78	27.36	26.03	1.33
P. R.....	9.29	8.43	.85	46.38	8.63	8.63	---	8.59	8.59	---	3.66	3.66	---
R. I.....	84.19	68.69	15.50	---	84.18	69.18	15.00	90.38	72.78	17.60	39.75	33.85	5.90
S. C.....	47.90	40.74	7.16	145.80	59.30	54.75	4.54	51.05	45.23	5.82	15.74	15.28	.46
S. Dak.....	80.67	68.17	12.50	---	65.33	65.33	---	67.48	67.48	---	35.20	35.20	---
Tenn.....	48.82	42.67	6.15	63.59	51.60	50.30	1.30	49.97	48.17	1.80	18.49	18.05	.43
Tex.....	70.30	58.64	11.66	---	68.93	68.93	---	57.44	57.44	---	18.30	18.30	---
Utah.....	79.13	56.34	22.79	151.41	85.45	59.17	26.29	79.46	40.16	39.30	38.90	29.94	8.96
Vt.....	84.56	49.38	35.18	333.17	66.50	60.93	5.58	69.53	59.60	9.93	30.52	30.52	---
V. I.....	37.13	31.13	6.00	32.47	(3/)	(3/)	(3/)	32.78	31.78	1.00	16.64	16.62	.01
Va.....	59.73	44.38	15.34	---	65.10	56.10	9.00	64.61	54.24	10.36	23.67	22.80	.88
Wash.....	74.44	63.95	10.50	141.38	85.08	70.37	14.71	53.28	33.60	19.68	38.84	34.46	4.38
W. Va.....	46.86	37.98	8.88	41.28	47.31	41.34	5.97	49.14	40.23	8.91	26.67	23.09	3.58
Wis.....	94.34	33.32	61.01	---	102.63	49.64	52.99	110.01	39.95	70.06	44.54	38.85	5.70
Wyo.....	81.84	69.13	12.72	(5/)	82.08	72.04	10.04	81.33	69.32	12.01	37.39	34.62	2.77

1/ Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both. Money payments may also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments for other than medical care. Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance. 2/ Less than 1 cent. 3/ Average payment not computed on base of fewer than 50 recipients. 4/ Except for aid to families with dependent children, data for each program represent average payments for recipients of the specified type of assistance under the combined program for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged. 5/ No payments made in August. 6/ Data for July; data for August not available. 7/ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits

Summary Data for August 1963

Current Month Data

Type of Benefit	Benefits awarded in August 1963		Benefits in current-payment status, end of August 1963			Amount of benefits paid 1/ in August (in thousands)
	Number	Average amount	Number	Monthly rate (in thousands)	Average amount	
Total, OASI and DI	318,948	---	---	---	---	$1,296,849
Total, OASI	282,728	---	---	---	---	1,196,212
Monthly benefits, OASI and DI	228,253	---	18,790,472	$1,240,980	---	1,278,879
Monthly benefits, OASI	192,033	---	17,392,289	1,151,011	---	1,178,241
Monthly benefits, DI	36,220	---	1,398,183	89,970	---	100,638
Old-age (retired-worker)	96,112	$80.62	10,143,769	778,895	$76.79	789,706
Disability (disabled-worker)	18,412	94.94	799,880	72,326	90.42	80,214
Wife's or husband's (OASI and DI)	34,320	39.14	2,735,045	107,838	39.43	111,398
Wife's or husband's (OASI)	29,134	40.01	2,573,122	102,610	39.88	105,298
Wife's or husband's (DI)	5,186	34.26	161,923	5,228	32.29	6,100
Widow's or widower's	23,355	71.93	1,967,002	130,924	66.56	136,169
Parent's	335	78.33	36,926	2,539	68.77	2,801
Child's (OASI and DI)	46,609	---	2,645,687	120,900	---	129,165
Child's (OASI--total)	33,987	---	2,209,307	108,485	---	114,841
Child's (OASI--life) 2/	9,535	29.20	417,801	11,577	27.71	12,265
Child's (OASI--survivor) 2/	24,452	52.97	1,791,506	96,908	54.09	102,576
Child's (DI)	12,622	28.97	436,380	12,415	28.45	14,324
Mother's	9,110	61.38	462,163	27,558	59.63	29,426
Lump-sum death payments	90,695	3/ $213.22	---	---	---	17,970

Comparative Data

Item	August 1963	July 1963	August 1962
Number of benefits in current-payment status, end of month:			
Total, OASI and DI	18,790,472	18,706,875	17,622,956
Total, OASI	17,392,289	17,311,974	16,430,156
Total, DI	1,398,183	1,394,901	1,192,800
Amount of benefits paid (in thousands):			
Total, OASI and DI	$1,296,849	$1,291,581	$1,228,242
Total, OASI	1,196,212	1,191,993	1,133,953
Total, DI	100,638	99,588	94,289
Number of old-age (retired-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	96,112	111,776	102,263
In current-payment status, end of month	10,143,769	10,093,798	9,529,995
Average old-age (retired-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$80.62	$80.78	$78.83
In current-payment status, end of month	76.79	76.73	76.15
Number of disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefits:			
Awarded	18,412	19,148	21,293
In current-payment status, end of month	799,880	795,213	699,534
Average disability insurance (disabled-worker) benefit:			
Awarded	$94.94	$94.80	$93.00
In current-payment status, end of month	90.42	90.38	89.80
Number of persons aged 62 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	14,731,000	14,662,000	13,879,000
Number of persons aged 65 and over receiving monthly benefits, end of month (OASI and DI) 4/	12,959,000	12,894,000	12,274,000
Assets of trust funds, end of month (in millions):			
OASI	$19,205	$18,223	$19,549
DI	2,388	2,329	2,508

1/ Exceeds monthly amount of benefits in current-payment status because initial payments include amounts payable for prior months. Distribution by type of monthly benefit estimated.
2/ Distribution by type of claim for OASI child's benefits estimated.
3/ Average lump sum per worker; there were 84,282 deceased workers represented in the current month's lump-sum awards.
4/ Numbers estimated to the nearest thousand.

FEDERAL CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

In the OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE

Social Science Researchers: interdisciplinary work on program and long-range research in areas such as prevention of dependency, social rehabilitation; evaluation of social welfare services and identification of social welfare needs. Social science research experience and/or advanced study in fields such as sociology, social welfare, economics, psychology or social anthropology is required.

In the BUREAU OF FAMILY SERVICES

Social Workers: with a general administrative background or with specific supervisory or consultative experience and a master's degree in social work to advise on programs or develop policies and consult on standards and procedures for

Welfare Organization and Methods	Medical Assistance and Services
Financial Assistance	Staff Development
Welfare Services	Community Planning
Social Rehabilitation	Emergency Welfare Services

Community Work and Training

Research Analysts: work on statistical reporting systems, trend analyses, program analysis and special studies concerning the public assistance programs. Social research and statistics experience in public assistance, or other social welfare or health fields is required.

In the CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Child Welfare Advisers and Specialists: consultative and administrative positions at national and regional levels provide consultation, develop standards, and participate in broad program development. Applicants especially desired with experience in foster care, social services to children in their own homes, and administration and organization of child welfare services. A master's degree in social work and at least 3 years of administrative, consultative or supervisory experience in child welfare are required.

Child Research Analysts: work on special studies, program analysis, and statistical reporting in child welfare, juvenile delinquency and related programs. Social research experience or equivalent graduate training in appropriate fields is required.

Positions are in Washington, D.C., Boston, New York, Charlottesville, Atlanta, Dallas, Kansas City, Chicago, Denver, and San Francisco.

UNITED STATES
OVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, $300
(GPO)